17th Cent. Gt. Bt.
Cataloged
(3)
Duke

A REPLY TO THE ANSWERER OF THE LETTER

Sent to the AUTHOR of a

PAPER,

CALLED

The Doctrine of *Passive Obedience* and *Jure Divino* disproved.

Pamphlet Collection
Duke University Library

Τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπόστρεψον σοῦ τὴν μάχαιραν εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς.
Πάντες γὰρ οἱ λάβοντες μάχαιραν, ἐν μαχαίρᾳ ἀπολοῦνται. Math. xxvi 52.

Angliæ res compositas velim, illæso Regis *veteri jure*. Grot. ad frat. Gul. Grot. Epist. 635.

Gaudeo ad probandam *veram, veteremque Christianorum sententiam de non opponendâ Regibus vi*, Aberdonensibus *probatam; neque inutiles ad id fuisse labores nostros*; Idem. ad Sams. Johnsonum Epist. 1118.

LONDON, Printed in the Year, 1690.

Advertiſement to the Reader.

THe Printer having miſtaken in Printing the *Columns*, p. 23, 24, 25, 26. 'tis thought convenient to advertiſe the Reader, that all which follows after *Column*—p. 21. l. 33. ſhou'd be ſtruck out, and inſtead thereof theſe words ſhou'd be added—*The Chief Texts which you quote in another; to which I ſhall alſo annex ſome Obſervations upon our Author's Expoſitions, as likewiſe ſome Remarks upon another Late Author; and Laſtly I ſtall give the true and plain meaning of theſe Texts (as the ancient and moſt Orthodox Expoſitours underſtand them.* The Reader alſo is deſired, to take notice that the Titles—*The Author's Comment*, &c. *and the Texts of Scripture* ought only to be ſet upon the Two firſt *Columns* p. 22. and the latter of them upon p. 23. on the right-hand-*Column* only. And p. 57. lin. 31. after—*Election it ſelf*—theſe words ſhou'd be added—*(provided the Conſtitution of the Kingdom be Elective)*

ERRATA.

PAg. 5. l. 27. betwixt *have* and *inheritance* add *we*. p. 7. l. 24. for *Rehoboam* r. *Jeroboam*. p. 7. l. ult. for to r. againſt. p. 24. *Column* ſecond l. 24. for *he* r. *the*. p. 48. l. 11. dele *that*. p. 57. l. 31. dele *not*. p. 59. l. 21. *for yet is* r. *yet it is*. p. 59. l. 30. after *ſworn* add *to maintain*. There are other faults, which the ingenious Reader will eaſily excuſe and correct.

Pamphlet Collection
Duke University Library

PAMPHLET COLLECTION
DUKE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

A REPLY TO THE ANSWERER OF THE LETTER

Sent to the AUTHOR of a

PAPER,

CALLED

The Doctrine of *Paſſive Obedience* and *Jure Divino* diſproved.

SIR,

THE Preface to the Objections ſent againſt your half ſheet, your pleas'd to call an *unneceſſary Prologue*, which therefore you have thought fit wholly to omit. I am willing to give you as little trouble as may be, and ſhall not ſpend time in proving either the neceſſity or pertinency of it. Whether it was properly accommodated to your Perſon you know beſt, and with your Conſcience I leave it. However if I was miſtaken in my ſuſpicions concerning you, you reſolve, it

seems, to be even with me; when, without mincing the matter, you call me *notorious hypocrite*: And that for no other Reason, but for *Preaching up Passive Obedience to others*, and yet at the same time, assuring you, *that I am and shall be, as averse from having my throat cut as you are.* p. 3, 6. of your Answer.

For, Pray Sir, consider again, cannot I be for the Passive Doctrine, but I must be *willing to have my throat cut*? And if I be not willing to *have my throat cut*, must *I need be for resisting any Man or Men whatsoever, who shall endeavour to take away my life contrary to Law*? What connexion is there betwixt these things? Or does there need an Oedipus to reconcile these *contrarieties* (as you call them)? May I not love my life so well, as to be *unwilling to have my throat cut*? And yet may I not at the same time, have such a regard to my Duty, as to be willing to part with my life rather then loose it Eternally, by ranking my self amongst the number of those, who by resistance, *shall receive to themselves damnation*? Upon second thoughts, it's probable, you may think your self too blame for passing such a rash censure upon me. However, I'm well assured, that no sober Man and good Christian, will judge me worthy of the Character of *notorious hypocrite*, meerly because I am willing to preserve my Life, as a Man endued with natural Inclinations, when yet I am ready to lay it down, rather then save it by such practises, as I judge repugnant to my Duty as a Christian, oblig'd by the Laws of Christianity.

In Truth, Sir, to deal plainly with you, your Reasonings in the Judgment of some of your Friends as well as my self, have so little weight and moment in them, that I am likely to make but very small Improvement of my time, by undertaking to examin and refute them. Abating some of your hard Words (such as *inhuman and damnable Principles* p. 37.) you bring nothing that would affrighten a well Educated School Boy (who, out of his *Catechism*, has been instructed in his Duty to God and the King) from undertaking you. I confess, by your half sheet, I guess'd that I had *ingaged with a*

Master

Master in the Cause; and was afraid that your strength of Reason, and dextrous Management might have caused me to have repented of my rashness, and have at least exposed me as an incompetent Defendor of *Passive Obedience*, tho' in it self, it be never so capable of being defended.

But I perceive, it is not always true, that second thoughts are the best and wisest; and that some Persons, to the end that their Readers may believe more then they can prove, boldly venture to promise more then they can perform. And whether or no you have made use of this Artifice (so common with all great undertakers) I leave it to any one to determin; who will take the pains to compare the several Propositions of your Title-page, with what you have said in the Body of your Book to prove them. He must be one of the *meanest capacity* indeedy who can perswade himself that you have made good your Title-page Propositions; unless it be to *the meanest capacity* in this sense.

You have (you say) set down my Answer *Verbatim*, that the *Readers may better judge of the ridiculousness thereof*. What the Readers will judge of my Answer, I know not; however I am oblig'd to you for your kindness. Pardon me, Sir, if in requital I do not set down your Reply *Verbatim*; for this would be to *Ridicule* the Reader, as well as to render the Reply it self *ridiculous*. I shall therefore only desire the Reader (of what perswasion soever, if intelligent) first to consider what you promise in the Title-page, and then examin whether you have substantially proved any one (much less every one) of those specious Propositions, with which you flatter the People? And if none of those nine rare things, which you promise to shew, shall appear to him after he has perused all your Paragraphs, he'l be apt, I believe, to judge you *ridiculous*, or something worse. They must either want wit or honesty, who propose mighty matters, when they perform little, or nothing at all. Yet such Quacks there are, and always will be in the World; and whether you be not sufficiently qualify'd to set up for one of them, I shall leave those to judge, who have

so

ſo much time to throw away, as to take a view of your wonderful curioſities.

But 'tis time to come to particulars. And here, becauſe we ſeem to be agreed about the number of Breaks or Sentences, in the firſt Paper, I ſhall obſerve the ſame Method in my Remarks upon your Reply, which you have; in your Obſervations upon my ſhort Return, to your *couragious Challenge to all the poor Paſſive Obedience and Jure Divino Men in all* England, *nay in the whole World.* And I intreat no other favour of thoſe, who ſhall think it worth their while to judge betwixt us, but that they will firſt read over every one of the Breaks or Sentences in the firſt Paper (which gave occaſion to this diſpute) and then conſider my Anſwer thereunto; before they proceed to *the Author's* Animadverſions thereupon; which when they have impartially examin'd, I deſire, in the laſt place, that they will read over this Rejoynder; and then, without Favour or Affection, judge whether of us two hath Right on his ſide; and hath done moſt Juſtice to the Principles of Reaſon and Religion, the Laws and Church of *England.*

(*N.r.*) To begin. In your firſt Paper, your firſt Propoſition is, that *God by no Word Binds any People to this or that Form of Government, till they, by their own Act, Bind themſelves.* To this I Anſwered, —*That Monarchy is the Government which God hath choſen above all others; and that the People, were always obliged to accept of that Form of Government which God had choſen for them, before they did actually Bind themſelves. SEE HIM* (ſaid *Samuel* to all the People) *WHOM THE LORD* (not you) *HATH CHOSEN.* 1 *Sam.* x. 24. Now what is your Reply? Why you quote a great many Texts of Scripture, and when you have done, make your own Remarks upon them, and then think you have effectually anſwer'd me. For example, becauſe the Text ſays.—*He told the People the manner of the Kingdom, and wrote it in a Book, and laid it up before the Lord,* 1 Sam. x. 25. you argue thus.—*Surely no Man will ſay, but that this Law was a Rule for the King to go by as well as the People. And then, where* (you aſk) *was his Abſolute Authority?* In which Argument you

insinuate, as if I denyed that the Law, or *Manner of the Kingdom* was a Law to the King as well as the People. Which I am so far from maintaining, that on the contrary, I do say, that the King as well as his People is obliged in Conscience and in the sight of God to observe the Law, as far as it concerns him. *Saul* when he broke the Law, which God had made the measure of his Power, was in the Court of Heaven no more excusable, than one of his meanest Subjects. Yet his Subjects had no Warrant to call him to an account for what he had done. So that his Authority, in this respect, was not at all diminished by the Law or *Manner of the King*. And thus you have an Answer to your Question, *where then was his Absolute Authority?* And indeed you do unluckily Appeal to this Law, or *Manner of the Kingdom, which* Samuel *wrote in a Book, &c.* For the Right or Prerogative of the King is therein so described, that it gives him an *Absolute Authority indeed*, over the People, whilst it leaves to them little else but the Obligation and Duty of Obedience. Such a Law or *Manner of the King* as this was, you would I believe, be very loath to have entered into our Law-Books, and inserted into the *Magna Charta* of *England*.

But because the People did solemnly own, recognise, and (as you express it) *confirm* their Kings, this (say you with particular respect to *Solomon*'s Case) *makes not a little for the Peoples Right in electing their Kings*. In truth this makes just nothing at all for the People's Right in electing their Kings. For how, I beseech you, doth it appear, that the People, have any Right to *elect*, when they are only to *approve* and *receive* him, whom God before hath chosen for them; as in the Examples of *Saul* and *Solomon*, to which you refer; 1 *Sam.* xi. 14, 15. 1 *Chron.* xxix. 22? As for what I said concerning *Jeroboam*, you grant that *he was elected by the People*; but withal (you say) that he was *King by the appointment of Almighty God*. And so indeed he was, as War, Pestilence and Famine are by the *appointment of Almighty God* but no otherwise; notwithstanding that Text, which you cite for this purpose very fallaciously. But so it often happens, that they

who

who accuſe others wrongfully, are themſelves ſuffer'd to fall into that Guilt which they charge upon their innocent Neighbour. 'You ask me with what face I can wreſt the Scriptures 'thus, in ſaying that the People's chuſing *Jeroboam*, is more 'then once called a Sin (Rebellion) when both theſe Texts, 'which you quote, relates to the foregoing Verſes, wherein 'tis ſaid, that *King* Rehoboam *ſent* Adoram, *that was over the Tribute*; *and all* Iſrael *ſtoned him with Stones, that he dyed?* which (Act of the People) was (you ſay) Rebellion, 'becauſe it was reſiſting the lawful Authority; beſides *Jero-boam* is not mentioned as King, till after this Act was Com-'mitted. This is the charge (with the Reaſons thereof) which you exhibit againſt me. I ſhall now clear my ſelf, and then ſhew, that the Fault you accuſe me of, you have really made your own by miſapplication of Scripture to your preſent purpoſe, either through Ignorance, or (which is worſe) evil Deſign.

As to the firſt I ſay again, that thoſe Places, 1 *Kings* xii. 19. and ii *Chron.* x. 19. do relate to the Rebellion of the Ten Tribes in falling off from *Rehoboam* their lawful King, to *Jeroboam* the Uſurper. For, as ſoon as they had heard *Rehoboam*'s Anſwer, which was according to the Counſel of the young Men, *v.* 14, they preſently began to be Seditious, gave the Signal of War, and were reſolv'd to have a King of their own making, and to caſt him off, who was the rightful Heir of the Houſe of *David*. *The People anſwered the King, ſaying, what Portion have we in* David? *neither have In-heritance in the Son of* Jeſſe. *To your Tents, O* Iſrael, *now ſee to thine Houſe*, David, *v.* 16. After they had thus bidden open Defiance to King *Rehoboam*, and were departed to their Tents fully purpoſed to carry on their Rebellious Enterpriſe, *Rehoboam* (hoping to appeaſe and reduce them to Obedience) ſent *Adoram* to them, but they were ſo far from hearkning to him, or any Conditions which he had to propoſe to them, from the King, that they preſently *ſtoned him with Stones, that he dyed*; and if *Rehoboam* had not with all ſpeed *fled*

in

in his Chariot to Jeruſalem, they would in all likelihood, have ſeized his Perſon, and uſed him as they ſhould have thought fit, *v.* 18. All this they did under the Conduct of *Jeroboam*, who headed them at the firſt, when they went to Petition *Rehoboam*, *v.* 3. without doubt therefore they had him in their Eyes from the beginning of their Defection. And ſo it may be truly ſaid that *this Act of the People* (*i.e.* Making *Jeroboam* King) *is* both in this place and ii *Chron.* x. 19.) *called Rebellion.* They reſiſted *Adoram*, becauſe (as they ſuppoſed) he was ſent to prevent their deſigns for *Jeroboam*; whom (as it follows in the next *v.*) they immediately, *made King over all* Iſrael. And now I appeal unto any one, who will impartially conſider this Hiſtory, as it is recorded in the places above mentioned, whether you have not unjuſtly accus'd me for wreſting of the Scriptures, when I ſaid, that theſe Illegal and Arbitrary Proceedings of the People in electing their New King, are in Scripture, mark't with the infamous Note of Rebellion?

Let me now ask you, How you can excuſe your ſelf from æquivocating, and wreſting the Scriptures to your own private Sence, when, upon the Authority of the Prophet *Ahijah*'s Words to *Jeroboam*,--*Thus ſaith the Lord, I will take the Kingdom out of his Son's Hand* (i.e. *Rehoboam*'s, *Solomon*'s Son) *and give it unto thee, even Ten Tribes*, i King. xi. 5, you affirm, *That* Rehoboam, *was a King, by the appointment of Almighty God, though elected by the People?* For what, I ask, do you mean by *the appointment of Almighty God*? That he permitted only this Defection, as a Puniſhment of *Solomon*'s Sin? or that he did poſitively approve and order it, as much as he did that *David* ſhould Succeed in the Throne, after the Death of King *Saul*? If the former; you ought plainly to have ſaid ſo, that the unwary Reader might not be deceived by an ambiguous Expreſſion. If the later; you muſt own and defend this falſe Principle, as grounded upon Scripture -- That *Uſurpers, and they who in an Hereditary Monarchy aſcend the Throne by the People's Defection or Rebellion to their lawful*

 Prince,

Prince, are as much by God's appointment, as they who poſſeſs the Crown by the Right of Hereditary Succeſſion. God, who ſees all things at once, foreſaw the People's Sin; which for the Puniſhment of *Solomon's* Luxury and Idolatry, he ſuffer'd to come to that height as to ripen into a proſperous Rebellion againſt *Rehoboam.* This, God was pleas'd to reveal unto his Prophet, and order'd him to tell it unto *Jeroboam,* in theſe words—*Thus ſaith the Lord, I will take,* &c.—What is there in theſe words whence we can infer, that *Jeroboam was a King by the appointment of Almighty God,* any more than we can conclude, from *Jeremiah's* Prophecy, concerning the Captivity of *Hezekiah* and the City (*Jer.* xxxiv) that this Captivity was *by the appointment of Almighty God?* the King of *Babylon* was ſuffered to burn the City and lead *Zedekiah* Captive; but yet in all this, the King of *Babylon* was nevertheleſs a grievous Tyrant; whoſe Cruelty and Injuſtice, God did by no means approve, or poſitively *appoint,* but only order'd and determined his Wickedneſs ſo, as to ſerve the ends of his Providence, in puniſhing the Sins of his People.

(*N.* 2.) All the difference betwixt us in this Point is, that you will needs conſider the *greatneſs of the Sovereign,* as accompanied with the *publick Detriment*; Whereas I am deſirous to joyn the *Sovereign Greatneſs* and *the Publick Benefit* together, and make theſe two Friends and Companions to one another. No Sovereign can become really Great by ſtriving to annihilate the well-conſtituted Government of his Country; neither can any People be happy by oppoſing and reſiſting their Sovereign in the Exercíſe of his juſt Rights and Prerogatives. *That Maxim, THE SAFETY OF THE PEOPLE IS THE SUPREME LAW muſt include* (ſays Sanderſon) *the King in it, and that eſpecially. It ſuppoſes there muſt be an unaccountable Authority in the Prince above all poſitive human Laws to whom it belongs to foreſee and order, that the Commonwealth receive no damage, either through defect of Law, or through the too-ſuperſtitious Obſervation of it.* Prelect. 10. *de Conſcient.* (*N.* 3.)

(*N.* 3.) In this Section you diſcourſe, methinks, like one who has a mind to ſay ſomething, though it be never ſo far from the Subject in hand. We are not here diſputing about the Form of Government, and yet you will needs, by the Head and Shoulders, bring in your beloved Notion——*That 'tis wholly left to the People to put themſelves into this or that Form of Government, which they ſhall think fit to chuſe.* This is beſides the buſineſs, and is alſo ſpoken of in it's proper place. What follows I cannot well reconcile to the Rules of Grammar. *And all Government whatſoever, though after the mutual Tyes of Reciprocal Oaths, are not joyned by God, though permitted by him.* If there be any meaning of theſe Words, I ſuppoſe it is, that all Government, as to the Form, is indifferent; and that none are bound by their Oaths to maintain the Government they live under, longer than it ſhall be to their good liking. If this be your meaning, I ſay, that this is not the proper place for you to inſiſt upon this Principle. Nevertheleſs I return this ſhort Anſwer. 1. That we do not find that God hath any where poſitively ordain'd any Form of Government, but that which is Monarchical. 2. That he who takes an Oath to be true and faithful to any lawful Form of Government, is bound to keep his Oath, till there ſhall happen an abſolute Impoſſibility of performing; or they to whom he ſwore, ſhall looſe him from his Obligation.

But now I am once again to account to this wiſe Expoſitor for wreſting the Scripture. *But how* (ſays he) *do you wreſt the Scripture?* And what's the Reaſon of this Emphatical Interrogation? Only becauſe I apply this ſaying——*What God hath joyned let no Man put aſunder*, to that near Conjunction there is betwixt the Head and the Members in Government, though 'tis indeed particularly ſpoken with Relation to Man and Wife, *Matth.* xix. 6. But, Sir, if this be to Wreſt the Scripture, better and wiſer Men than you or I do fall under this Condemnation. Some may call it Wreſting the Scripture to quote the firſt Chapter of St. *John* for our Saviour's Divinity. And it ſeems as irkſome to you to hear any Text

apply'd to that near Relation there is between the King and his Subjects; as it is to thoſe to ſee any places of Scripture produc'd for our Lord's Divinity, which contain (as they think) no ſuch thing. This Propoſition, *what God hath joyned let no Man put aſunder*, is indefinite; and may be properly apply'd to any two Relatives, which God hath joyned together, by ſuch an *inſeparable* Union as is not to be diſſolv'd but by himſelf.

But, for diſputation ſake, you're pleas'd to grant, that King and People are joyned together by God. And upon this ſup-'poſition you argue, that as *a Wife may be put away for Forni-'cation, ſo may a King forfeit his Right to his People by endea-'vouring to overthrow the Government, and Eſtabliſh an Idola-'trous Religion.* This Argument will do you no Service, till you can produce ſome Text, wherein God hath as plainly allow'd a Divorce, betwixt a King and his Subjects, for miſgovernment, as he has in this, betwixt Man and Wife in the caſe of Fornication. We read of many bad Kings amongſt the *Jews*, but we do not find that the People were therefore permitted to depoſe them; no, not though they endeavoured *to Eſtabliſh an Idolatrous Religion.* Beſides, to make the Argument run Parallel, it rather lies thus; an Husband may put away his Wife for the Caſe of Adultery; therefore the King (who is Head of his People, as the Husband is of his Wife) may cut off an Idolatrous People, from the benefit of his Laws. At the end of this Paragraph you maintain, *that the ſafety of the Body* (*i. e.* the People) *is to be valued before the Head* (*i. e.* the cheif Governour.) And I agree with you, if you can convince me, that ever any body can be in health, or indeed can live, without its Head. But you go on; and give us this pleaſant Reaſon for what you ſay, *Becauſe 'tis an eaſie matter to get an Head to the Body, but not a Body to the Head.* Now, in my opinion, the one is every jot as eaſie as the other, and 'tis no leſs difficult to fit the Head with a Body, then 'tis to match the Body with an Head; that is, if they be once ſeparated, 'tis abſolutely impoſſible in nature to find

find an Head to animate the Body, or a Body to ſerve the Head; and in Politics, 'twill be found very difficult ſo to adapt them, that they may live together in Peace, and good Correſpondence with one another. The beſt way therefore is not to divide them; that neither the Head may be forc't to ſeek its Body, nor the Body its Head. 'Tis uſual to cut off a corrupted and gangreen'd Member, when no Cure can be apply'd; but to ſever the Head (though it be very ſick) from the Body, or divide the whole Body (though full of Diſtempers) from the Head, is ſuch a Method of Cure as never ſurely was Practiſed by any Chirurgeon. The Union betwixt them, is ſo cloſe and neceſſary, that nothing but Death ought to looſe and diſſolve it.

(*N.* 4.) All that's here to be conſider'd, is, Whether any force or violence have been uſed to King *James*? You ſay not, but others (as good Proteſtants as your ſelf, and who had better opportunity of knowing the Truth in this matter) think otherwiſe. I do aſſure you, if we have taken up Arms againſt our Lawful Sovereign, we cannot vindicate our ſelves either by the Law of the Land, Nature or of Self-preſervation. For the proof hereof I refer you to *Sir Edward Cook in his Calvin's Caſe*; and *the Vindication of the Authority*, &c. *of the Church, Printed at* Glaſcoe, *p.* 7, &c. *p.* 10, *p.* 35, &c.

(*N.* 5.) *The People* (you ſay) *made the Law the Meaſure of their Privileges, in the buſineſs of the Ship-money.* But how much ſoever the Law, at the firſt, might be on their ſides, ſurely you will not deny, but that they ſtretch't their Priviledges beyond their due Bounds; when they did not only refuſe to pay this Tax, but thence alſo took an occaſion to rob the King of all thoſe Prerogatives, wherewith, by Law, he was inveſted; and at laſt, of Life it ſelf. Did their Priviledges Authorize them to lift up their hands againſt his Perſon, and imbrue them in the Blood of that Glorious Martyr. Suppoſe that King *Charles* the *Firſt* was as Arbitrary, and every ways as evil a Prince, as his Rebellious Subjects repreſented him.

Yet

Yet shall Subjects (says the Homily against Disobedience. *Part* 1.) *both by their wickedness provoke God, for their deserved punishment, to give them an indiscreet and evil Prince; and also Rebel against him, and withal against God; who, for the punishment of their Sins, did give them such a Prince?*

(*N.* 6, 7.) In my Answer to your *6th* Proposition, I said, that *Kings are God's Vicegerents, and that they who resist them, do resist the Ordinance of God, though the Person be a* Claudius *or a* Nero. I say so still. To disprove this, you tell us, That *a Vicegerent is one that is appointed*; but *Kings* (you say) *are not appointed by God to Govern the World*, contrary to what you asserted in your *1st* Reply; where you say, that even *Jeroboam* himself, *was a King by the appointment of Almighty God.* But it was not for your turn to say so in this place. For here you are to prove that Kings are not Vicegerents; and therefore in order to this conclusion, you contradict your self, and assume, *that Kings are not appointed by God*, &c. Yet, as if you repented of what you have said, you alter your Note, and in the next Words, allow—*That they may be properly called his Vicegerents, whilst they Administer Justice and Equity to every Man.* But how if one or two, or some few of their Subjects should be wronged by them, must they be degraded, and fall from their Character of being God's Vicegerents for this defect of Justice and Equity? This, methinks, seems a little hard. But to let this pass; I'm glad to find that we are agreed so far. 'Tis some favour however that you'l grant, that *good Kings may be very properly called God's Vicegerents*, though you will not give this Title unto those that are bad, which yet I do not know how you can well deny, if you will own (what you have said) That *Jeroboam* was none of the best of Kings; and yet he was (you say) *a King by the appointment of Almighty God.*

To be a Vicegerent is to be in the stead, or to supply the place of another; and accordingly when we say, that Kings are God's Vicegerents, the meaning is, that they Act in his Name, and by his Authority: Which they may do, and yet be

be themſelves very bad Men. He who is inveſted with the Kingly Office, doth in many reſpects (recited at large by the Lawyers) reſemble the Divinity, and is fitly ſtyled God's Vicegerent, when yet he may fail very much in the Duty of his place. But if you will not be ſatisfied, that your King is God's Vicegerent, unleſs you can ſee the very Commiſſion, which he hath immediately received from the hands of God himſelf, I confeſs, I know no more how to convince you, than I do an Atheiſt; who obſtinately denies, that there is a God, becauſe he never ſaw a miracle wrought, whereby his Exiſtence was demonſtrated to his Senſes. If you be ſo ſcrupulous, I doubt, there never was, and never will be any King according to your mind, but ſuch an one, as will acknowledge himſelf to be not God's, but the Peoples Vicegerent.

All that follows in this Paragraph, is a Declamation againſt *Abſolute Authority*; which I tell you again, I do attribute to no King upon Earth, nor ever did any Sober Man. I ſay expreſly, *That Abſolute and unconditionate Obedience is due only to God, who alone puts Abſolute Authority.* Nevertheleſs, the *King as God's Vicegerent*, being the higheſt Power upon Earth, ought to be obeyed in all things lawful, by a ready compliance; in things unlawful, by ſuffering for Conſcience ſake, rather than reſiſt by Force of Arms. For, *who can ſtretch forth his hand againſt the Lord's Anointed, and be guiltleſs?* 1 Sam. xxvi. 9.

As a Comment upon which Text, hear what Biſhop *Sanderſon* ſays in his Twelfth Sermon *ad Aulam*. *No conjuncture of circumſtances whatſoever, can make that expedient at any time to be done, that is of it's ſelf and in the kind unlawful, for a Man to Blaſpheme the Holy Name of God, to Sacrifice to Idols, to give wrong Sentence in Judgment, by his Power to oppreſs thoſe that are not able to withſtand him, by Subtilty to over-reach others in bargaining, to take up Arms (offenſive or defenſive) againſt a lawful Sovereign, one of theſe and ſundry other things of like nature being all of them ſimply,* et de toto genere *unlawful, may not be done by any Man, at any time, in any caſe, upon any colour or pretenſion whatſoever;*

the

the expreſs Command of God himſelf only excepted, as in the Caſe of Abraham *for Sacrificing his Son; not for the avoiding of ſcandal, not at the inſtance of any Friend, or command of any Power upon Earth. Not for the maintenance of the Lives or Liberties either of our ſelves or others; not for the Defence of Religion; nor the Preſervation of a Church or State; no, nor yet, if that could be imagin'd poſſible, for the Salvation of a Soul; no, not for the Redemption of the whole World.*

I am now to clear my ſelf from an Indictment which you draw up againſt me, *of making God the Author or Approver of the Uſurpations of Men.* This, I do aſſure you, I do abſolutely deny; and could very eaſily retort it upon your ſelf, if I ſhould unravel all the pernicious Conſequences of your popular Principle. But what you have here ſaid, ſhall not provoke me to it. Perhaps hereafter I may do it, if you ſhall give me occaſion, by perſiſting in your falſe Calumnies and Malicious Aſperſions. In the mean time, take this ſhort Vindication of my ſelf. God, 'tis moſt certain, is not the Author of Sin, neither doth he approve any wicked Practices; Yet he who ſhould go about to kill his Father, or any ways to offer violence to him, becauſe he is an habitual Drunkard, or Swearer, or (to come nearer to the Caſe) a very Tyrant in his Behaviour towards him; This would be not only to reſiſt the Wickedneſſes, and unjuſt Rigor of the Father, but alſo the Ordinance of God; and by all good Chriſtians, would be eſteemed a breach of the V. Commandment: And 'tis no leſs ſo, I ſay ſtill, to riſe up in Arms againſt our lawful Prince, *though the Perſon be a* Claudius *or a* Nero. This later (though a Tyrant, a Perſecutor, a Murtherer, and what not?) was included in that general Order which St. *Paul* gave to the Church. —*Let Prayers and Supplications*, &c. *be made for Kings and all that are in Authority*, &c. —And *you muſt needs be Subject* (ſaid St. *Peter*) though *Domitian* (one every whit as bad as *Claudius*, and almoſt as ill as *Nero*) was then (as 'tis thought) the *Roman* Emperor. The King's Authority is ſo abſolute, as it makes him unaccountable to his People

People; never ſo Abſolute as to give him a Right, any more than to one of his meaneſt Subjects, to do Violence, or Injuſtice to any Man. Abſolute Authority, thus underſtood, did appertain to the Kings of *Iſrael*, although they were bound to obſerve the Law, not out of fear of being puniſh'd for their neglect, by the People, but by God himſelf. And thus the Kings of *England*, in Conſcience towards God, are oblig'd to keep thoſe good and wholſom Laws which are made for the benefit both of King and People, yet (do not deceive your ſelf) the *Engliſh* Presbytery has no more Power over the Kings of *England*, than the Levitical Prieſthood had over the Kings of *Iſrael*.

The Imperial Crown and Juriſdiction of this Realm is (ſays Archbiſhop *Cranmer* in his Letter to Queen *Mary*) *taken immediately from God, to be uſed under him only, and is Subject unto none but God alone*; Apud Fox. tom. 3. p. 672. The People of *England* have no Power to judge their Kings, whether they be good or bad. If they have any ſuch Authority, pray be ſo kind to your Friends, as to make out their Title; and ſhew, in what Capacity they may lawfully Exerciſe this Right. Is it, when ſome of the chiefeſt *Demagogues* are aſſembled together, and call themſelves an *High Court of Commiſſion?* If ſo, then *Bradſhaw* and his Aſſociates did nothing but what was juſt, and King *Charles* the I. was in the wrong, when he refus'd to acknowledge their Juriſdiction. But this, I ſuppoſe, our Author himſelf, whatever he thinks, is ſcarce ſo hardy, as to maintain. Is this Power lodg'd in a Convention? That cannot be. For they who have no Power to judge concerning the leaſt Matters, cannot certainly Judge and Condemn the King himſelf. But if it belongs neither to an High-Commiſſion-Court, nor to a Convention to bind their Kings in Chains, This perhaps may be a priviledge which is peculiar to the *Almighty and uncontroulable MOB*. And truly, when 'tis *lawful for every Man to do that which is lawful in his own Eyes* (the ſpecial Prerogative of the *Sovereign Mob*) then, and not before, it will be lawful for the

Multitude, to judge which are good Kings and which are bad ones, and to execute their Judgment upon them, as they ſhall think fit. Thus, if we conſider the People in all their Capacities, we cannot find this Authority in any of them; and therefore we muſt conclude, that there is, indeed, *no ſuch Power upon Earth*; unleſs you can perſwade us after all, that every ſuch buſy Fellow as your ſelf may ſit in the Seat of Judicature, and (having pronounc'd the King *Guilty*) looſe the People from their Allegiance.

(*N.* 8, 9, 10, 11.) The Queſtion (occaſioned by your 11*th.* Maxim, Aphoriſm or Propoſition, chuſe how you will have it call'd) is, *whether every Man has the Right of Self-preſervation, as intirely under Civil Government, as in a State of Nature?* You hold the Affirmative; I, the Negative. Now in order to come to a reſolution in this Point. 1. It would be neceſſary to inquire whether indeed there ever was ſuch a *State of Nature*, as you mean, in the World. I confeſs I much doubt it. For when, I pray, and where? In what Time, and Country, was this *Libertine State* to be found? For my part I never read of any ſuch; neither is it reaſonable to believe that God ever placed Men in ſuch a confuſed State. For he who made all things in Number, Weight and Meaſure, never left Men (the beſt and moſt beautiful part of the Creation) without Laws and Government, and a mutual dependance upon one another. *Adam*'s Sons (as ſoon as they were born) were under the Government of their Father, as his Dominion likewiſe was over all the other parts of the Creation. And had he continued in the State of *Innocence*, this orderly dependance of Inferiors upon their Superiors, would have been ſo free and unconſtrain'd, that there would have been no Violence offer'd to any Man; and ſo the Principle of Self-preſervation would have had nothing to have done in this Golden Age. This therefore cannot be the State of Nature which you mean. And as for that fictitious and imaginary Hypotheſis, which *Hobs* lays down as the Ground and Foundation of his Antichriſtian Politicks, 'tis a meer Phantaſm

taſm (to uſe one of his own Words) of his own, quite beſides the intention of God and Nature. Yet this Leviathan-State, this Hobbian-Republick muſt be the State you mean, when you ſay——*Every Man has the Right of Self preſervation as intire, under Civil Government, as in a State of Nature.* Suppoſing therefore ſuch a *State*, let us, 2. conſider the truth of what you ſay. Now in this State all Men you know have (according to Mr. *Hob*'s Doctrine) a Right to all things; and therefore every Man (in this bleſſed State) has a Right to kill every other Man, who ſhall offer to oppoſe him in the acquiſition of his juſt *Right* (as he thinks it) and not ſuffer him to become an Univerſal Proprietor of all the World. Now I hope you will yield that this unlimited Right (or rather boundleſs Luſt) is reſtrain'd under Civil Government, when the Power of the Sword is lodg'd in the Hands of the Supreme Magiſtrate; *For the puniſhment of Evil doers, and for the praiſe of them that do well.* Men's private Reaſon is not now to be their meaſure in righting or preſerving themſelves; but the publick Reaſon of the Community, muſt give ſuch bounds and limits to their indefinite deſires, as may moſt conduce to the good of the whole. Private Perſons (whatever Right of Self-preſervation they might have in the State of Nature) after they are incorporated into Civil Society, have no more than the Law doth allow; and that, in all Governments, upon Computation, will be found much leſs than Mr. *Hobs*'s State-of-nature-men do arrogate to themſelves.

(*N.* 12.) You now grow Angry, and breath Vengeance and Antichriſtian Principles againſt Paſſive Obedience; which never did you, nor any body elſe any harm. Why ſo furious? Be not ſo paſſionate. For (as the *Italian* ſays) *Molto cattivo giudice è l' affetto. Paſſion is the worſt Judge in the World.* Whilſt you give way to it, I can expect neither fair dealing, nor any good Senſe from you.---The Point to be examined, is, *whether more Throats have been cut by the Doctrine of Paſſive Obedience, or that of Reſiſtance?* You ſay the former has been more guilty, in this Particular. And to prove your Opinion,

you appeal to the Cruel Perſecutions under the *Roman* Emperors, the Maſſacres of *Paris*, *Piedmont and Ireland*. Now I am ſo far from being of your mind, That I do verily believe, that the Doctrine of Paſſive Obedience did never cut any Man's Throat, and has been always Innocent both in the time of the *Roman* Perſecutions, and more modern Maſſacres. As for the *Roman* Perſecutions, The Primitive Chriſtians, 'tis certain, had deeply imbibed the Doctrine of Paſſive Obedience, They were fully perſwaded, that they could reſiſt without Sin; and therefore pay'd a willing Submiſſion to the Emperor's Coerceive Power, when they flatly deny'd to do what he Commanded. And thus the Paſſive Doctrine brought many to the glorious Crown of Martyrdom; but I never read, that it ever cut any one's Throat, or took upon it ſelf, by War and Violence, to diſpoſe the Crowns of this World. You may as well Condemn the Doctrine, *of not doing evil that good may come of it*, for cutting Throats, as this of Submiſſion in all Caſes, to the higher Powers. And in truth theſe two are ſo nearly related, that they muſt needs live and dye, ſtand and fall together.

As for the Maſſacres of *Paris*, *Piedmont* and *Ireland*, if thoſe Proteſtants were Butchered for their Religion, when by their unanimous Reſiſtance they might have ſav'd themſelves, they dye Martyrs in a good Cauſe. But if the Dragoons and Tories fell upon them on a ſudden when they did not expect a Perſecution, and were unable to make any Reſiſtance, The Doctrine of Paſſive-Obedience cannot be Arraign'd, as guilty of their Deaths. Yet woe be to their Perſecutors, by whom ſuch an irreparable offence was given to the Chriſtian Religion.

But now you come up nearer to me, and ſuppoſe at leaſt, the *contrary* (i. e. *that more Throats have been cut by the Doctrine of Reſiſtance, than that of Paſſive Obedience*) *but the Sin* (you ſay) *lies at their doors, who by their cruel Perſecutions, and violation of the Rights of the People, force them to right themſelves.* You mean, force them to Rebel. Now I do affirm, that no

Man

Man was ever forc'd to commit Sin; and that *Rebellion* is a Sin, all Men muſt acknowledge, who do not eſteem *Witchcraft* as a Vertue. They therefore, who Rebel becauſe the Prince is a Tyrant, and endeavours unjuſtly to take away their Lives; are far from being guiltleſs, though they have the greateſt Provocations imaginable. Such Princes are deſervedly odious in the ſight of God and Man; yet their Subjects ought not to reſiſt by Force of Arms: For this would be to oppoſe one Sin by another. And beſides, would make it an impoſſible thing, that there ſhould be any ſuch thing, as *Perſecution, for Righteouſneſs-ſake.* For when Subjects are too ſtrong for their Prince, they may, nay (according to this Principle) they ought to reſiſt, rather than ſuffer. And when they are too weak, they ſuffer only becauſe they cannot help it; which is no Vertue at all. For there can be no Perſecution for Righteouſneſs-ſake, which is not undertaken, and endured with Freedom, Chearfulneſs, and Voluntary Submiſſion to every *Ordinance of Man for the Lord's ſake.*

The reſt of this Section, you ſpend in raveing, and talking wildly without reaſon, order and coherence. I have no mind to expoſe you, though you do give ſufficient occaſion for a Man to lay you open to the World; as one who has Sacrificed both his Wit and Judgment to his Paſſion and falſe Notions of Government; which Education and Intereſt, have deeply imprinted on his mind. *We ought not to defend our Religion, when the Laws of the Country are againſt it.* This is one of your Propoſitions. Which, I confeſs, ſounds very odly in mine Ears. If we ought *not to defend our Religion, when the Laws of the Country are againſt it*; when, I pray, ought we to defend it? But your meaning is, I ſuppoſe, that we ought not to defend our Religion *by Force of Arms*, when the Laws of the Country are againſt it. Neither ought we, after this manner to defend it, *when the Laws of the Country are for it.* But *the Scripture* (you ſay) *does not require us not to defend our Religion* (*or civil Rights*) *Eſtabliſh'd by the Laws of the Country.* Here you touch this point ſo tenderly, as if you was conſcious, that it will not abide a thorough

thorough Examination—*The Scripture does not require us not to defend— Our Religion or Civil Rights.* The first of these Expressions mollifies your *Doctrine of Resistance* very much. For if *the Scripture does not require us not to defend*, then *the Scripture does not positively require us to defend, &c.* And so we seem to be agreed thus far, that the Doctrine of Resistance is not taught in the Scripture. The second way of expressing your self alters the State of the Question, and makes it altogether ambiguous. *Our Religion or Civil Rights*—as if our Religion and Civil Rights were the same thing; and a Man could not enjoy the one without the other. I wish you would inform us, how this wonderful Transmutation is to be made. If you have an Art to turn Property into Religion, and make *gain to be Godliness*, you ought to be more sought after, than any Chymist of them all, who is *verè adeptus*, and has attain'd the Secret of turning Metals into Gold. But perhaps you may think me too light. To be more serious therefore; I Answer, that the Scripture medles not with Mens Civil Rights: and as for Religion, it has prescrib'd a way to secure it, without such defence, as (in all probability) will ruin both our Religion and Civil Rights. *A Christian boldness in confessing the Truth, and Patient suffering for it, is the best and only lawful means of throwing off the Tyranny and Yoke of Antichrist, if laid upon the Necks of Subjects, by their lawful Sovereigns.* (*Oxford University's* Reasons against the Covenant drawn up by Bishop *Sanderson p.* 210, 211.)

But if we may not defend our Religion, any Army or Number of Heathens may come, and settle their false Religion here. No, Sir! 'Tis lawful and our Duty to resist a Foreign Prince, who unjustly Invades his Neighbours Country, let his pretence be what it will. But if our Religion and Rights should be Invaded by our own lawful Prince, then earnest Prayers to God, humble Supplications to the King, unfeigned Repentance, and Amendment of our Lives are the only proper Weapons of our Christian Defence. *If a Foreign Power* (says Dr. C.) *opposes our King, he is a Robber: If he be a Subject, who rises against his Sovereign,*

Sovereign, he hath renounc'd Christianity with his Allegiance, and is to be esteemed a Troubler of our Israel. *Therefore whatsoever they be that are Enemies to the King, and whatsoever the pretence be, we wish they may never prosper. Comp.* to the Temple, *Part* 1. *p.* 177. Thus doth this worthy Author Answer both your Cases—*that of a Foreign Prince, and that of our own Sovereign.* And as to the later, that is, *the point of Resistance, if our Religion and Rights should be Invaded*, by our own Prince; be pleas'd to consult the *D. of C's. Excellent Letter to the Lord* Russel.

The eminent Man of whom you have heard (and whose Name you seem to be ignorant of, tho' you Appeal to his Book) was one *Lucifer Calaritanus*, who wrote a Book *de Regibus Apostaticis*; wherein he has spoken some things which shew him to have been a Person of more zeal and warmth, than temper and Christian moderation. This Book I do not find approved by St. *Athanasius*, as containing Orthodox Doctrine; though he did indeed recommend the Two Books, which were Written by the same Author, in behalf of himself against the Emperor *Constantius*: But these Books were Written before *Julian the Apostate* came to the Empire; and so could not be occasioned by his telling the Christians, *that their Doctrine was to suffer.*

Having thus made some Reflections upon your loose and incoherent Sayings, I should now examin your Interpretation of several Texts of Scripture; which Province I wish you would leave unto those who are better able to manage it. Let a *Socinian* be the Interpreter, and the Scripture shall speak nothing but his Sense. And if one of Seditious Principles be allow'd to comment upon the Bible, we shall be sure to find nothing therein but comfortable Doctrine for those *who despise Dominion, and speak evil of Dignities.* I shall here insert your Explications of the Texts alledged in one Column, and ~~their true meaning~~ (as the most Ancient and Orthodox Expositors have understood them) ~~in another~~; that the Reader may have an Antidote against your Poyson.

The

the chief Texts wch you quote in another to wch I shall also annex some observations upon Authors Expositions, as likewise some remarks [illegible] lastly I shall give you

The Author's Comment or Paraphrase.

WHere the Word of a King is (according to the Law or Custom of the Country) *there is Power, and who may say unto him, what do'st thou?*

Submit your selves to every Law of Man, *for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the King* as cheif Executor of the Laws, or unto Officers appointed by the King, for the Executing, or fulfilling of the Laws.

Let every Soul be Subject to the Laws, or Customs of the Country; and to the Prince as Executor thereof: For the greatest Villain amongst Mankind, acts by the Power of Almighty God; but not by his Appointment, or Approbation. The Power which every Man hath, is from God. *They* therefore *that resist* the Laws, *resist* the Powers (beyond which a Prince hath no Power)——*For he is the Minister of God for good*, whilst he administers Justice, and Equity to every Man; and punisheth him that doth evil, or violates the Laws. Wherefore ye must needs (if the Laws be against you) suffer according to the Laws of the Country, though never so unreasonable. Render therefore to all their Dues; Tribute, Custom, Fear and Honour to whom it is due by the Laws of the Land.

The Texts of Scripture.

WHere the Word of a King is, there is Power; and who may say unto him, what do'st thou? Eccles. viii. 4.

Submit your selves to every Ordinance of Man, for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the King as Supream; or unto Governors, as unto them that are sent by him; for the punishment of Evil Doers, and for the praise of them that do well. 1 Pet. ii, 13, 14.

Let every Soul be Subject to the Higher Powers. For there is no Power, but of God. The Powers that be, are ordain'd of God. Who so therefore resisteth the Ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For Rulers are not a Terror to good Works, but to the evil. Wilt thou not be afraid of the Power? Do that which is good; and thou shal't have praise of the same. For he is the Minister of God to thee for good: But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid: For he beareth not the Sword in vain: For he is the Minister of God, a Revenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be Subject, not only for wrath, but Conscience sake; for this cause pay you tribute also: For they are God's Ministers attending continually upon this very thing. Therefore render to all their Dues;

Tribute

Tribute to whom Tribute is due; Custom to whom Custom; Fear to whom Fear; Honour to whom Honour. Rom. xiii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

Observations upon the *Author's Expositions.*

I. I Observe upon his first Paraphrase, That (which he himself confesses) the King's of *Israel* were absolute and unaccountable to the People, for their Actions; whether they were good or bad; whether they were according to the Law of God (*the only Law and Custom of that Country*) or no: And therefore their Commands, 'tis plain, were not to be disputed *ore gladij, by the Sword's point*, though they were never so unjust: And consequently though the Author's Exposition is true, yet it is not full, and doth not reach the true intent and meaning of the Words.

I Observe II. That if St. *Peter by every ordinance of Man*, means *every Law of Man*, then the Words must run thus——*Submit your selves to every Law of Man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the King as the Supream Law, &c.* And if this be so, what will become of the People's Title to judge and dethrone their King? Thus our Author outwits himself, and in effect destroys the Principle, which he pretends to maintain. But *Secondly*, I suppose his meaning is, that both the

This Doctrine of Obedience, the *Author of the enquiry into the present State of Affairs*, calls St. *Paul's System of Government*; as if the Apostle made Systems of Government, as the Astronomers do of the Heavens. This expression seems a little too light and Philosophical in so serious a matter. But that which is more remarkable, is, that having set down these Seven Verses, as if they were self-evident and needed no further Explication, he only adds his decisive Judgment upon them, as follows—*in these Words we have the Duty of the Magistrate, as well as the Obedience of the Subject set forth, and so mixt together, that we must conclude, that upon the Total failing of the one, the other does likewise cease.* The Duty indeed of the Magistrate as well as the Obedience of the Subject, is set forth in these Words; but here's not a Word of the *Subjects Obedience ceasing*, if the *Magistrate* shall not perform his *Duty*. Nay, St. *Paul*, 'tis evident, had no design to teach any such Doctrine, but only to lay down a certain and Eternal Rule of Christian Obedience to the *Supream Powers*,

the Laws and King's are made by the People, and are both ſo far to be ſubmitted unto, as they have the People's conſent, and good likeing; and no farther. But neither will this Comment agree with the Text. For thus, the Apoſtle ſhould rather have expreſt himſelf after this manner. *Submit your ſelves to every Law of Man* (not *for the Lord's*, but) *for the Peoples ſake*, ſo that ſtill we are at a loſs, how to make the Words hit with our Author's Senſe: And we are more to ſeek, how to make them conſiſtent with St. *Paul's*: who expreſly teaches, *that there is no Power but of God.* But our Expoſitor is, I believe, not much concern'd whether St. *Peter* be conſiſtent, either with himſelf, or his Brother Apoſtle St. *Paul*; 'tis enough, he thinks, if he can but hale his Words into his own Opinion, and fit them to that Syſtem of Government, which he hath form'd to himſelf; which yet, he hath not done.

I Obſerve III. That in his Paraphraſe upon *St. Paul's* Words, he will needs ſtill divide the *Higher Powers*, betwixt the Laws, and the Prince; whereas nothing is more plain, then that the Apoſtle ſpeaks of Men (and not Laws) inveſted with Regal Authority. *Secondly*, He ſeems to inſinuate, that the Power of the meaneſt Perſon, is as much from God, as that of a Supream, Independent Prince. *The Power* (ſays he) *which every Man* The

though they *did* never ſo much abuſe their Power. For had his intent been to have inculcated upon them this Principle —*That Obedience ceaſes, upon the Total Failing of the Magiſtrate to perform his Duty*; he would in effect, have Preach't to them Sedition and Rebellion, inſtead of Submiſſion and Obedience. For the Emperor, then in Poſſeſſion, was one of the worſt, that ever was; and if ever any Prince, Totally fail'd in his Duty, he certainly did. Yet notwithſtanding, that he was ſo very bad, he gives them not the leaſt liberty to diſobey; but on the contrary puts them in mind, more than once, of that *good* which they did and might receive under his Government, though he himſelf, was one of the worſt of Men.—— But if Obedience do *Totally ceaſe* upon the *Total failing* of he Magiſtrate to perform his Duty, I would gladly know when it may be adjudged, that the Magiſtrate doth *Totally* fail in his Duty? Is it, when he notoriouſly violates the Law of Nature? No, that cannot be: For the Emperor, when this Epiſtle to the *Romans* was Written, did ſo, in the higheſt degree. Is it, becauſe he Perſecutes Chriſtianity? Not this neither: For this Emperor did ſo. Is it, becauſe he endeavours, to ſubvert the Laws of the Land? Not ſo neither: For how can this be a greater Crime, than the notorious violations of the Laws

hath is from God. Thirdly, He has thought fit to say nothing at all to the great Sanction, of this Christian Law, concerning Submission to the Supream Authority — *And they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation.* This was too hot for him to touch. I pray God, that he may never feel the smart of it hereafter. *Fourthly*, He tells us, we *must needs suffer according to the Laws of the Country (if they be against us) tho never so unreasonable.* Now for my part, I think there is little difference, whether a Man suffers by *unreasonable Laws*, or the Arbitrary and *unreasonable Edicts of a Sovereign Prince*, as the Primitive Christians did. Nay, if I must suffer, I should rather chuse the latter than the former way. For *unreasonable Laws* (if made by the general consent of the People) shew, that the generality of the People are so too, who would consent to such Laws; and therefore 'tis not probable that they will, in a little time, be brought to acknowledge their Error, and repeal their *unreasonable Laws*; so that a Man may languish under them, as long as he lives, and his posterity after him, without any redress. But a *Sovereign Prince* is but one Person; and he, it's likely, may more easily be perswaded to revoke his *unreasonable Edicts*; or Death may take him off, and prevent him (sooner than a Body of Men) from Executing what he designs. *Fifthly* and

Laws of Nature, and the Persecution of Christianity. What therefore is this *Total failure*, and wherein doth it consist? Surely it can be nothing else but when a Prince is Totally depriv'd either of Reason, or of Life. And in this Sense I grant the Subjects Obedience to that Individual Person must needs *cease*. We are then at last come to this, that in case of Lunacy, or Phrensy, or Death, the Subjects Obedience *ceases*, and no otherwise. The last of these doth naturally dissolve the Relation between a Prince and the People; and the other two by a moral necessity; if by many, repeated and habitual actions they can be undeniably proved in the Face of the whole World; yet so, as that, where the Government is hereditary, it shall be put into the hands of a Guardian, one or more; as in the Case of Infancy. But now none of these Cases will serve the design of the *enquiry*. But however, the business was done as effectually, as if he, who stood in the way betwixt some Person's Ambition and the Crown, had been either an Ideot or a Madman; in his Cradle, or his Grave. But it was at this time necessary to tell the People, that *the Magistrate had Totally fail'd in his Duty*: And then *we must*, forsooth! *needs conclude* (not from St. *Paul's Words* which intimate no such thing, but from our *own lusts*, which we call

and *Lastly*, our Author makes no difference betwixt *Obedience and Subjection*, which he ought to do. For thus all pretence of Resistance will be taken away, and yet the Subject secured from committing Sin, by an actual Obedience to any *sinful* or unlawful Command. Whereas, if Absolute Submission be not a Duty, when active Obedience is not, we may resist by Force of Arms; and *so, do evil that good may come of it*; directly contrary both to the Apostolical Precept, and Practise.

the *necessity of present Affairs*) that upon the *Total failing of the Magistrate's Duty, the Subject's Obedience does likewise cease.* But *my Soul! come not thou into their Secrets.* And may I never be one of those *jolly Casuists*, who to serve a present turn, will at least, endanger not only the *damnation* of themselves, but their Neighbours also. I confess, that I have not *strength of thought* enough, to manage such an hardy enterprise, as this is.

The true *Sense* and *Meaning* of these *Places of Scripture.*

Where the Word of a King is, there is Power; the Commands of a Sovereign Prince proceed from one who Acts in the Name, and by the Authority of God Almighty, *And who may say unto him what dost thou?* And who can call him to an account for his Actions.

Submit your selves to every ordinance of Man, if you cannot actively obey, yet at least submit your selves to all Superiour Magistrates, *for the Lord's sake* (by whose Authority they Act) *whether it be to the King* (next under God) *in all Causes and over all Persons, Supream; or unto Governors, as unto them, that are sent by him*, Ministers Commissioned by him *for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well*: The end for which both the King and his Ministers are appointed by God; which yet, if they shall not fulfil, you must nevertheless *Submit, for the Lord's sake.*

Let every Soul be Subject to the Higher Powers. Let every Person, of what quality, rank and condition soever, be Subject to the King and his Subordinate Ministers. *For there is no Power but of God.* For both the King (or Emperor) and they who Act under him, are Authorized by God himself. *The Powers that be, are ordained of God.* The Emperor and his Ministers are (I say again) invested with their Authority by the God of Order. *Whoso therefore resisteth the Power* (they who by force and violence, oppose the

the Emperor and his Ministers) *resisteth the Ordinance of God* (do oppose or fight against that Order which God himself hath Establish'd amongst Men) *And they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.* And they that do thus oppose God in his Ministers, shall be severely judged. This free and voluntary Subjection is a good Work; and though you may suffer by it, yet having the Testimony of a good Conscience, you will have no cause to fear the Magistrates Power: *For Rulers are not a terror to good Works but to the evil.* For not they who do good, but they who do evil, have reason to be afraid of their Governors——— *Wilt thou then not be afraid of the Power?* Wilt thou behave thy self so, as not to have any just fear of thy Rulers Power? *Do that which is good.* Act as a good Christian ought to do in all Cases; especially in this instance, of dutiful Submission to the Emperor, and all in Authority under him; *And thou shalt have praise of the same.* By this means thou wilt, it's probable (however thou oughtest to) gain his favour. *For He is the Minister of God to thee for good.* For the Power which God hath given him, is design'd for thy encouragement in well doing. *But if thou do that which is evil* (by resisting his Power, and other evil practises) *Be afraid* (thou hast cause to be afraid) *For he beareth not the Sword in vain,* which he would do, did he not punish all Rebellious, and wicked practises of what kind soever. *For he is the Minister of God, a Revenger to Execute wrath upon him that doth evil* (whether by resisting his Authority, or otherwise) *wherefore ye must needs be Subject* (so that there is a necessity of this Absolute Submission) *not only for wrath, but Conscience sake* (not only for fear of punishment, but out of the Sense of your Duty, which you owe to your Sovereign Prince, for the Lord's sake) *For, for this Cause, pay you Tribute also:* Now, that you ought to submit not only for fear of Punishment, but for Conscience sake, appears from the Taxes which are Levy'd upon you, and which you're oblig'd in Duty to pay: *For they are God's Ministers attending continually upon this very thing.* For (once more I tell you) all Sovereign Powers are ordain'd by God for the good of the World, which they ought carefully to attend——*Render therefore to all their Dues; Tribute to whom Tribute is due; Custom to whom Custom; Fear to whom Fear; Honour to whom Honour.* Render therefore unto all what justly belongs unto them; *Tribute, Custom, Fear and Honour* to the Emperor and his Ministers; unto whom they are more especially *due*, both by the Divine and Imperial Laws.

And

And now for a more full answer to your Paraphrase, and all that follows in this long Paragraph, I refer you to the Reverend D. *P's* Paraphrase upon Proverbs; which you'l find faithfully quoted in the History of *Passive Obedience*, p. 84. ——And since my saying, *This is right Commonwealth Rhetoric*, hath chaft you into all this heat, and made you spend so many unnecessary words, let me direct you to another Learned Author who runs the Parallel between the deposing Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, and the Commonwealth Principles, in these Three Particulars. (1.) In setting up a Court of Judicature over Sovereign Princes. (2.) In breaking the Oaths and Bonds of Allegiance Men had entered into. (3.) In justifying Rebellion on the account of Religion. *Jesuite's Loyalty. History* of *Passive Obedience*, p. 133.

I shall now leave the Impartial Reader to judge, whether you or I may be justly charg'd for having wrested the Scriptures. Nay, Sir, be your self the Judge, whether I have not given the true and genuine Interpretation of these Texts? And whether you be not *Self-condemn'd*, and a *Wrester of Scripture* by your own Rules? Your charge runs in these words. ——*What a Sin are you and all other Men for Passive Obedience Guilty of, that wrest the Scriptures, which were appointed for the Suffering State of Christianity, whilst under Heathen Princes and without Laws to support them; and compare them to the present Circumstances?* Here you manifestly yield, that the Interpretation of the Scriptures, which most favours the Doctrine of Passive-Obedience, is most agreeable to the *Suffering State of Christianity, whilst under Heathen Princes, and without Laws to support them.* Now 'tis certain, that all the whole New Testament was Written during this *Suffering State of Christianity.* Judge therefore, whether they who interpret it in this Sense, do not give the true, proper, immediate and genuine Meaning of it or no? If it be to wrest the Scriptures, to explain and apply them as they were intended, then indeed we who are for *Passive Obedience* are Guilty of this Sin, but

but if this be to deal truly and faithfully with Men in the great Concern of their Souls, then we are not to blame: but thoſe cannot be excuſed, who, to ſerve a turn, Wreſt and Wire-draw the Scriptures from their *Original and Primitive Signification*; as if there was one Senſe of them for the *Suffering State of Chriſtianity*, and another for the *preſent Circumſtances*.

(*N.* 13.) The People (I agree) are not bound actively to obey any Commands of their Prince, which are repugnant to the Laws of God and the Land.

(*N.* 14.) *The Oath of Allegiance*, or *Corporation Oath* (after all your toſſing and tumbling to caſt it off) ſticks cloſe to you; and (like a faithful Monitor) is continually at your Elbow, to warn you, that you muſt never rebel, let the pretence be what it will. What can be more plain, than the words themſelves—I do ſwear, *&c. That it is not lawful upon any pretence whatſoever to take up Arms*, &c. Yet this Oath (you may be ſure) was not deſigned for our ruine. It doth indeed cut off all hopes of deſtroying the Monarchy, if Men would keep their Oaths; and to ſuch as are given to change, it may indeed be grievous, but to none others, who deſire *to live quiet and peaceable Lives in all godlineſs and honeſty*. This Oath doth not (as you would have us to believe) make the King a Tyrant by Law, neither doth it allow him to be ſuch: but it hinders Subjects from being Rebels, and will not allow them to be ſuch againſt all Law, Reaſon and Chriſtianity. *For a Rebel is worſe than the worſt Prince, and Rebellion is worſe than the worſt Government of the worſt Prince that hitherto hath been.* *Hom.* againſt *Obed. Part.* 1. In ſhort, this Oath is agreeable to the Doctrine of our Church ever ſince the Reformation. *No Subjects may draw their Swords againſt their Prince for any cauſe whatſoever it be*; ſay *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, *Redman* and other Worthies of our Church, *in their Declaration of the Chriſtian Doctrine*, An. 1537.

(*N.* 15.) *If Negative Reſiſtance* (as you here define) *is to diſobey the Commands of the Prince, when according to Law*,

Then

Then *David* by flying from *Saul* (which you ſay in your firſt Paper, was his negative Reſiſtance) did diſobey *Saul's Commands, when according to Law.* How theſe things can be reconcil'd I deſire to be inform'd. As for *David's* 600 Men, though they might not be all intended for Spies and Scouts; yet the overplus might be no more than one in his Circumſtances (being Heir apparent to the Crown) might reaſonably keep about him for his Guard. As for *Athaliah*, 'tis ſure, that ſhe was an Uſurper, and 'tis moſt probable, that therefore ſhe was depos'd, and not for Murthering the King's Sons, and her other Acts of Cruelty: for many other Princes were very cruel and unjuſt, and yet we do not read that they were depos'd.

(*N.* 16.) *Neither an Invaſion actually made, nor eminently feared by a Foreign Power, doth Authorize Subjects to depoſe their King.* This is my Propoſition. To which you anſwer? *We have not depos'd the King*, &c. That he is, by force, diſpoſſeſt of his Throne 'tis certain, call it by what new Term of Art you pleaſe. However we may endeavour to palliate the matter, the Papiſts (we may be ſure) will ſay, 'tis neither better nor worſe than *Depoſing our King*; and that, we do now ſeem to be agreed with them in this Point; how ſeverely ſoever we have formerly condemn'd it. And I am ſorry, That Chriſtians, and Proteſtants, and Church-of-England-men, ſhould give them this occaſion to account us their Proſelytes, by the Practice of that Doctrine, wherein we were before, ſo viſibly diſtinguiſh'd. *Hoc Ithacus velit*, &c.

But if King James (you tell us) *had kept the Law, he never had loſt his Rights*, &c. Sir! neither you nor I know this; for they who neither love nor fear their King, will always find ſome pretence or other to be rid of him, whether *he keeps the Law or not.* But taking it for granted, that King *James* did *violate the Law* in as high a degree as you would perſwade us he did: Is this a ſufficient Warrant for us to break the Law and our Oaths too? Where then is our *Subjection for Conſcience ſake*? Where is our *Obedience for the Lord's ſake*?

This

This is a Doctrine, *which we ought heartily to deteſt as falſe and ſcandalous in the Suppoſition; and in the Inference ſeditious and deviliſh.* How defective ſoever the King may be in performing his part, this doth not excuſe our neglect, or diſcharge us from our Obligations.

The publick quiet and ſafety requires, that he who robs another Man, or fires an Houſe, ſhould ſuffer Death for ſo doing. But that it is for the publick benefit, that Kings ſhould be accountable to their Subjects, and puniſh'd by them for their Miſdemeanours, this I utterly deny, unleſs you can ſhew, that it is for the publick good, to act directly contrary to God's Commandment. 'Tis a greater Evil (all things conſider'd) to depoſe bad Kings, than to ſuffer the ill Conſequences of their Miſgovernment: and beſides, 'tis Rebellion againſt God himſelf as well as his Vicegerent. And notwithſtanding whatever his Holineſs Pope *Hildebrand*, and the Reverend Fathers of the Society have Taught or Practis'd to the contrary; This is, and ever will be a moſt certain truth; *For Subjects to reſiſt their Sovereign Prince upon any pretence whatſoever, is unlawful and impious.*

Your ſilly and improper inſtance *of a Father's diſinheriting his Eldeſt Son*, is not worth taking notice of. It ſuppoſes forſooth, the People to be the Father, and the King, as their Son; A good Child indeed, ſo long as he behaves himſelf as he ought to do; otherwiſe the Rod is ready for him, and he muſt be whip'd. I am aſham'd of ſuch indecent and fulſom Compariſons. I agree, that *Our Conſtitution is the happieſt in the World*; but by ſuch State-menders as your ſelf, I pray God, it doth not become one of the worſt in Chriſtendom.

If all be true, that you ſay, of King *James*—*That he took upon him the whole Authority*—*That he made himſelf the ſole Fountain of the Government*—*That he govern'd by his Abſolute Will and Pleaſure*, &c. Yet from all theſe Premiſes, it doth not follow—*That his Subjects are abſolv'd from the Oath of Allegiance, as much as if he was actually dead, and had ſign'd a Reſignation of*

his Crown. For the Crown of *England* is Imperial, and no Forfeiture can be made, by any degree of Male-Administration. The King of *England* is as much a King before he has taken the Coronation-Oath, as after: And if he ſhall neglect to perform it, after he has taken it, the Government doth not therefore lapſe to the People. And to argue otherwiſe, is to reaſon like a Man, who neither underſtands the unconteſtable Rights of our Kings, nor the Duty of his Subjects. The Regal Authority remains, though the King abuſes his Power; and the Duty of Subjects is not diſſolv'd, though he extends his Authority beyond the juſt Rights of a King.

In the next place, you fall upon the Topick of *Reſignation, and Deſertion of the Government.* This Argument has been ſo throughly ſkan'd, and ſo judiciouſly manag'd by the *Author of the Deſertion diſcus'd*, that it ſeems to be wholly forſaken. Your ableſt Pens cannot maintain this Cauſe: Let me therefore adviſe you by no means to undertake it. Before you venture ſo dogmatically to determine, that, what King *James* did was a *publick Reſignation of his Throne to the Nation*; you ſhould conſult the Hiſtorians for ſome Parallel Inſtance, which has been adjudg'd, and generally receiv'd as a Reſignation. But becauſe you preſent us with no ſuch Example, I ſhall take it for granted, that there is none of that Nature; at leaſt, that you know of none ſuch. The Caſe of *Edward* the IV. ſeems to have been the moſt like that of King *James*; and yet it was never judg'd to have been a Deſertion, Reſignation, or Abdication; neither was it ever call'd by any of theſe hard Names. I ſhall give it you, as 'tis related by *Philip de Comines*, a Perſon of good Account amongſt the Hiſtorians both for his Judgement and Integrity. He tells us, that, *Edward* the IV. being deſerted by his Soldiers, was overpower'd by the increaſing greatneſs of the Earl of *Warwick*: That therefore he was forc'd, for his own Security, to make his eſcape into *Holland* firſt, and afterwards into *Burgundy*: That, he ſoon after returned into *England*; And, though he brought no great Force with him, yet by the revolt of the

Duke

Duke of *Clarence* (King *Edward*'s Brother) with 12000 Men from the Earl of *W.* to the King's Party, he became ſo ſtrong, that he defeated the Earl in a pitch'd Battle; and in 21 Days recovered his Kingdom, which the Earl of *W.* had taken from him in Eleven. Now the Plea of Abdication or Deſertion was never made uſe of againſt King *Edward* the IV. though it might, as plauſibly, have been objected againſt him, as it is now againſt King *James* the II. For he went away (as appears by the ſtory) with as great Precipitation, and as much Surpriſe to his People, as King *James* did. And he appointed no body to officiate in his ſtead, when he was gone; neither did he take any care for the Adminiſtration of the Government in his abſence, *Phil. Comin. p.* 92, 93, 94, &c. *Engl. Edict.*

You go on, and ask, *What can be ſaid for* Scotland? I alſo put the ſame Queſtion. And you muſt give us a more ſatisfactory Anſwer, than you have yet return'd to it, or we muſt conclude that in truth, *nothing can be ſaid for* Scotland; with what forehead can you ſay that King *James* was never lawful King of *Scotland*, if he never took the Coronation-Oath? Has it not always been an undoubted Truth received by our Lawyers, *That the King of Great Britain, is ſo, before he has taken the Oaths*? As for that *Abſolute Authority*, by which, you ſay, he govern'd in *Scotland*; upon inquiry, I believe, it will not be found ſo Abſolute, as you would repreſent it; and, if it was; whether it was therefore *reaſonable as well as neceſſary, to throw off this Arbitrary and Unlawful Governour*, you, I preſume, are not ſo well vers'd in the Conſtitution of that Kingdom, as that we may ſecurely rely upon your Judgment in the Caſe.

And the ſame Queſtion, which you put about *Scotland*, you may alſo propoſe concerning *Ireland*. For the *Iriſh* (when the King left *England*, were (as at other times) governed by his Deputy-Leiutenant, and ſo his going away could have no Impreſſion upon that Nation. Thus have you raiſed Objections, which all that you're able to ſay, can never conjure down again.

Well! but if no Forfeiture can be made, what muſt be done? what Anarchy? what Confuſion? what Ruine and Deſtruction to the utter extirpation of our Civil Rights and Religion, deſtroying many 1000 *Souls*, &c. *muſt have follow'd?* In anſwer to all which, I could eaſily repreſent the Tragical Conſequences of *Depoſing*, in a much more diſmal Dreſs. All theſe ſad things which you mention, *Anarchy, Confuſion, Ruine, the loſs of our Civil Rights and Religion, deſtruction of many* 1000 *Souls*, will inevitably follow the depoſing Practice; beſides, that which is more to be fear'd than all theſe, *Eternal Damnation.* 'Tis needleſs to enlarge upon this Subject; both you and I have *talk'd* more, than the Reader (if he has not very little to do) will have cauſe to thank us for. Yet I cannot conclude this Section without taking notice, of that unbecoming Irony, which you paſs upon the Prayers and Patient Submiſſion of the Church, in the Caſe of a bad Prince; who will not obſerve his Oath. *We muſt* (ſay you) *e'ne have ſet down and cryed, Lord have mercy upon us, and expect* (have expected) *our deliverance by Miracle, though Miracles are ceas'd.* Sir! you ſeem to be a Man not much given to Wit; and I wiſh (for your own ſake as well as Chriſtianity in general) that you had not vented it upon this occaſion. *Though Miracles are ceas'd*, yet the Doctrine of our Bleſſed Saviour and his Apoſtles do ſtill remain and ſhall continue for ever. *Though Miracles are ceaſs'd*, yet, I hope you will not ſay, that God's Providence is alſo *ceas'd.* Tho *Miracles are ceas'd*, yet his care over his Church is not *ceas'd.* Had we *ſate down and cry'd, Lord! have mercy upon us*, as we ought to have done; God would have been glorified by our Sufferings; and, in his good time, he would have reſcu'd us from them, *without a Miracle.* When the edge of Sovereign Authority is turn'd againſt us, then to *cry unto the Lord in our diſtreſs*, is no ſuch deſpicable means of Deliverance as you may imagine. I have read of ſome Tyrants, who have been more afraid of the Prayers of good Men, than of all the armed force of their Enemies; but I never met with any good Chriſtian, who truſted more to his

Temporal,

Temporal, than his Spiritual Weapons; and thought it in vain to betake himſelf to his Prayers, if he might not, at the ſame time, ſecond them with his Sword. Believe me, Sir, or rather beleive the whole Primitive Church, that there can be no better oppoſition againſt a Tyrant, than the *amendment of our Lives, and conſtant Prayers to God. Though Miracles are ceas'd*, yet, for the ſake of our common Chriſtianity, do not deſpiſe, a *Lord! have mercy upon us.*

N. 17.) Here you ſtate the difference betwixt the Authority of a Private Perſon and a King. And, if your Politicks hold good, 'tis only this—*That a Private Perſon has no Authority at all, but to live according to the Laws; whereas a King is an Executor of the Laws.* A wonderful diſcovery! for which ſurely you expect no leſs, than that all Kings ſhould return you their thanks; and reward you, for this great Invention. I would fain (as you tell me) ſet the King above the Laws, but I'm ſure *your Hypotheſis* places him under them. I had thought that 'tis the Prince, who gives life and breath to the Law, and that his *Le Roy Le Veut*, ſignifies ſomething more than to be a meer Executor of the Law; which every petty Conſtable is, in his proper Diſtrict. The King, 'tis true, is Executor of the Laws; but let it be always remember'd, that he is *Supreme Executor and Legiſlator* too.

N. 18, 19. The matter to be inquired into, is, What makes a *true* and *real* King? I ſay, *he that aſcends the Throne by a regular Title, is a true and real King.* No, ſay you. *'Tis Poſſeſſion, taking the Coronation-Oath and governing according to Law, which makes a true and real King.* Let the matter be argued; 'Twill be granted, I ſuppoſe, that he is a *true and real* King, whoſe Title is neither Defective, nor Counterfeit; and that his Title who comes regularly to the Throne is thus qualified. I conclude therefore that ſuch an one is a *true and real* King. As for *Poſſeſſion, taking the Coronation-Oath, governing according to Law*, theſe Titles, taken either ſeparately or altogether, do not exclude all defect, and counterfeit. A Man may take Poſſeſſion

by

by Violence; He may ſwear to govern according to Law, and alſo Rule according to his Oath; yet his Title may be defective, as that of the Houſe of *Lancaſter* was; and it may be counterfeit, as *Simnel*'s and *Warbeck*'s had been, had theſe Impoſtors ever been crown'd.

As for your Inſtances of *Sigisbert* King of *W. Saxons*, that of *Edward* the II. and the other of *Richard* the II. 'tis not two or three Preſidents in 7 or 800 Years time, that can make a Right; much leſs can theſe Examples (always condemn'd but when they ſerve a turn) prejudice the Ancient Law, Cuſtom and Manner of the Kingdom. As for *Henry* the VII. he did not openly diſavow reigning in the Right of his Wife. The Act of Parliament, by which he was recogniſed King of *England*, was capable of this Interpretation, as the Lord *Bac.* obſerves in his *Henry* the VII. and ſo, by this Conſtruction, no Injury was done to the Hereditary Right of the Crown. Beſides, *Elizabeth* the Queen *de jure*, made no Claim, and conſequently, did tacitly reſign, which ſeemed to make him *de jure*, as well as *de facto* King. The Law (which you mention) in *Edward the Confeſſor*'s Reign, you muſt know, good Sir! is no Law, unleſs you reckon the ſaying of a Pope to be ſo. For this (as I am inform'd) is no more. And if you once begin to obtrude the Dictates of his Holineſs for Laws upon the Nation, upon my word, your Cauſe will ſuffer by it; and you muſt have a care, that you be not anſwered with a *Præmunire* from *Weſtminſter-hall*. By the Clauſe in King *Henry's Charter*, you mean, perhaps, that in King *John*'s quoted in the Paſtoral Letter, out of the Original Articles; as we are told. However this is more to your purpoſe; and I ſhall therefore conſider it. Now. 1. This was King *John's* own Grant; and therefore cannot be pleaded as the original Right of the People. 2. It was a Grant extorted by Force and Violence; and therefore tranſfers no legal, and regular Right. 3. It was the Grant of a King, whoſe Miſery, or Puſillanimity, or both, made him formally reſign his Crown into the hands of the Pope; and therefore, 'tis no wonder, that he ſhould

ſubject

ſubject himſelf to the Barons, and People of *England*; as the moſt likely way to ſhake off his Sovereign Maſter, by engaging his Subjects to ſtand by him in the recovery of his loſt Rights and Reputation. It was the Popiſh Yoke, which then lay heavy upon his Shoulders, and ſunk him thus low; And to argue, that what he did, in this forlorn Condition, ought to be a Law to all his Succeſſors, is a Popiſh Concluſion, drawn from Popiſh Premiſes; and does not become thoſe, who would be eſteemed the great Advocates of the Proteſtant Religion. And indeed, all the Precedents which you, after others, make uſe of, to uphold your tottering Cauſe, are drawn from thoſe times, wherein Popery was Predominant in *England*, as well as in other places; and therefore ought not to weigh with us now, who do not ſtand upon that bottom.

(*N.* 20.) The Oath mentioned, *Eccleſ.* viii. 2. was the *Oath of Allegiance*, and (if you will) *of Supremacy too*, which the People took to the King, by and with the approbation of God himſelf. This Oath we all have, or ought to have, taken; and we have called God to witneſs the truth of our Intentions, Endeavours and Reſolutions to perform this Oath: and if we dare for any reſpect whatſoever, violate this Oath; if for fear of plundering and undoing, Death and Torment; Hope of keeping our Eſtates, or getting more; If for theſe or ſuch like Motives, we ſhall preſume to be falſe to this Oath, we have juſt Reaſon to fear the Judgments of God upon us, who will not *hold him guiltleſs, who taketh his Name in vain.* There's no limitation in theſe Oaths of *Allegiance and Supremacy*, no more than there is in the *Proteſtation*; and for us ſo to limit, diſtinguiſh and ſubtleliſe the Senſe of theſe Oaths, as to make them no further obligatory than they ſhall make for our preſent wordly advantage, is contrary to the ſimplicity of an Oath; is a ſcandal to our Religion; and (in plain terms) is neither better nor worſe, than (as Biſhop *Sanderſon* expreſſes it) to *play faſt and looſe with God himſelf*,

himſelf, at the ſame time when we call him to witneſs the ſincerity, truth and ſingleneſs of our Intentions.

God puniſhed the King of *Jeruſalem*, for breaking the Covenant he had made with the King of *Babylon*, *Ezek.* xvii, from *verſe* the 12. to the 21. but was the King of *Babylon* therefore abſolv'd from his part of the Covenant, ſo far as it was not expreſly conditional, or neceſſarily ſo, in its nature? You might here have obſerv'd, *That this Oath* is *not only* call'd *the King of Babylon*'s *Covenant*, but that God himſelf alſo calls it, *mine Oath*; but then, you ought to make this ſerious Reflection, That an Oath taken to a lawful Sovereign is queſtionleſs no leſs the *Oath of God*, no leſs than this, which was taken to *Nebuchadnezer* the Conquering Tyrant. And if God held himſelf oblig'd to puniſh the breach of this Oath, will he *hold them guiltleſs* (think you) who can ſo eaſily diſpenſe with the Oaths which they have taken to their rightful King, when no Conqueſt is pretended? In the Oath which the two Spies ſwore to *Rhahab*, there was a condition plainly mention'd. *But if thou utter this buſineſs, then we will be quit, &c.* Joſ. 11.20. Would any one therefore but your ſelf, from this particular, conclude in general—*That the Non-Performance of an Oath on one ſide, makes the other become void?* What reaſoning is this? Pray Sir, ſhew us that you are a Man, at leaſt, of ſome common Senſe, though you be no great Clerk. Your Argument from the Father's ratifying or diſannulling the vow of his Daughter; or the Husband's, that of his Wife; ſeems more proper to the buſineſs in hand; but yet, when 'tis nearly examin'd, we ſhall find it as lame and imperfect, as the reſt. Daughters and Wives are immediately under the care of their reſpective Fathers and Husbands, and therefore by their Authority they might confirm or vacate the vows of their Wives and Daughters; but what is this to an Oath taken by the People to their Prince? Who ſhall diſpenſe with this Oath? ſurely none but the Prince or God himſelf. If the Prince doth not, let any one ſhew me, that God, by his word, hath abſolv'd me, and I will be his Proſelyte as long as this Oath remains lawful in it ſelf, and poſſible

to

to be perform'd, ſo long it certainly binds if any Oath can oblige the Conſcience. But if Oaths are but Words,

——— And Words are but Wind,
Too feeble Inſtruments to bind;

then, I confeſs, they are in the right of it, who (to ſave themſelves and their Fortunes) reſolve to take any Oaths, and keep none. Then--- *Jura & Perjura, ſecretum prodere noli*---- is a commendable peice of Prudence; and they who walk by this Rule (or rather no Rule at all) are the only wiſe Men, whoſe example we ought to follow. But if this Wiſdom deſcend not from above, but (like the groſs Vapors of the Earth) ariſes from beneath; and is *Earthly, Senſual, Deviliſh*; then God grant I may never be amongſt the number of theſe *Wiſe Men*, but rather one of thoſe *fooliſh and deſpiſed things*, who chuſe Affliction, rather than Sin; and to be miſerable in this World, rather than run the fatal Riſque of being ſo hereafter.

Our next Inquiry is, Whether Protection, be the only Ground and Foundation of Allegiance? You ſay it is. And your Reaſon is, becauſe *the Prince Swears to Govern and Protect the People according to Law*, &c. So then, *'tis Swearing to Govern and Protect the People according to Law*, that is the Foundation of Allegiance, and not barely his *Protecting and Governing the People according to Law*, if he doth not *Swear* to do ſo. And thus Allegiance at laſt, is reſolv'd into the *Coronation Oath*. But what if the Prince is willing, when he is not able to Protect his People according to Law, as he has Sworn? What if another, ſtronger than he, ſhall come and dethrone him, and (taking the Government into his own hands) ſhall himſelf ſwear to *Govern according to Law?* Muſt I obey the former, or the later? My rightful Prince, who has Sworn, and is willing but not able to Protect me? Or the other, who has alſo Sworn, and is (*we'll* ſuppoſe) as willing, as he is able to Protect me? Not the former; for his Power is gone, and he

cannot

cannot Protect me, though he has Sworn that he will, and is desirous to keep his Oath. I must therefore, according to your Principles, obey the later; and thus at last the longest Sword carries it, and becomes the *only sure Foundation of Allegiance*; and consequently the King of *France*, as I said (at least if he shall *Swear to Govern according to Law*) ought, if he be the strongest, to be received by all those who make Protection the only *Foundation of Allegiance*; so unluckily do some Men form their Arguments (when they design to serve an Interest) as to oppose that very interest, which their Arms are at the same time employ'd to support and maintain.

N. 21.) I'm glad to find you so favourable as to grant, *That 'tis not every little violation of the King's, by which the Subject is absolv'd from the Oath of Allegiance*; but if *the King endeavours to overthrow the Government*, &c. *They are not* (you say) *bound by this Oath, to stand still, and let him.* But if the Sovereign Authority cannot lawfully be resisted by Force of Arms, they can only perswade, remonstrate, humbly beseech, and intreat him not to follow such evil Councils. And this you know, was done by the great Confessors of the Nation. This Oath, in your judgement, is not to be taken in the literal Sense; and you reckon up the grievous inconveniences, which would thence ensue. Now I confess, I have hitherto thought, That all Oaths are to be taken *in the plain literal and Grammatical Sense*, and no other; for this only is the Sense which cuts off all *Æquivocations and mental Reservations whatsoever*; whether Jesuitical, or Puritanical. I must needs tell you, that you do here advance the most *pernicious and damnable Principle*, both in respect of Religion and Civil Society, that ever any Man, since *Symon Magus*, pretended to countenance. If an Oath is not to be taken *in the literal Sense*, then what doth it signifie, Whether I swear to observe and teach the *Articles and Canons of the Church of* England, or those of the *Council of Trent*? Whether I undertake to make the *Bible* or the *Alcoran* the Rule of my Faith? To tell People that an Oath is not to be

be taken in the Literal, but in any Senſe whatſoever they ſhall put upon it, is quite contrary to the Nature and End of an Oath; which is, to cut off all ambiguity, and double dealing with one another. And this can never be, if the Words of an Oath muſt not be taken in their *plain, common, obvious and Literal Senſe.* As for our Baptiſmal Vow (which you endeavour to debauch, as if it did Authorize your Principle of Reſiſtance) I pray God, that we may all keep that better than hitherto we have done, and then we ſhall, I doubt not, be leſs Solicitous, how to find out evaſions, whereby we may abſolve our ſelves from the *Oath of Allegiance.*

Your Head is ſo full of Government, and King *James*'s violation of it, that the frequent repetitions of theſe things, do ſerve you for Anſwers to every thing; and conſequently, to nothing. Here follows a great deal to this purpoſe; which I ſhall paſs over in ſilence, as I deſire to do hereafter, as often as I ſhall meet with the ſame *Crambe repetita.*

The Fortune of War in *Flanders* (which you inſiſt upon) comes not up to the preſent Caſe. For, our late Revolution, is not a Conqueſt; neither is it ſo received, the Title is grounded upon another bottom. *Firſt*, that of the Peoples Election. *The Scripture directs Obedience* (you ſay) *to the Powers in Being.* You ought to have added, *upon the pain of Damnation.* Now put theſe two together, and what will hereafter become of them, who were lately ſo far from obeying *the Power in being, i. e.* King *James*, that they deſerted, betray'd and oppos'd him. He was 'tis evident the *Power in Being*, and whilſt he was ſo, by your own Rule, the Word of God pronounces them diſobedient Rebels and Traytors, who forſook and delivered him up into the hands of his Enemies.

Hitherto you have labour'd to prove, That if the King breaks his Coronation Oath, his Subjects are abſolv'd from that of Allegiance. You do now give us a word or two, concerning the King's Obligation to obſerve the Coronation Oath, when his Subjects do not keep that of Allegiance. And to

what you say, let those return an Answer, who are concern'd. ——*If the People endeavour to destroy or kill the King, the Coronation Oath neither does nor can bind him to Protect them; but on the contrary, he commits a notorious Sin against the Law of Nature, if he does not defend himself, and destroy them; if there is a necessity for it, to preserve himself.*

(*N.* 22.) My Assertion is, *that the Public would suffer more by the Impunity of bad Subjects, than of evil Kings.* You maintain the contrary. And the reason which you offer is, *because Subjects are punishable for the least Misdemeanors, and the King not.* But if it once be taken for granted, That Kings are punishable by their Subjects, the People must judge when 'tis fitting they should be corrected; and to save themselves from being punished for their own faults (whether great or small) they'l, you may be assured, be beforehand with the King, and judge his small Misdemeanors to be great Crimes; and will call him to an account for them, when they are strong enough to set a Guard upon him, and bring him before an High-Court of Justice in *Westminister-Hall.* Then *the Motes* in the King's Eye, shall (through their false Opticks) be magnifyed into *Beams*; and they (not beholding the Beams in their own Eyes) will be very much concern'd to clear the King's Eye-sight.

When the *King ceases to Govern by Law*, he doth not (as you say) *cease to govern*, but he ceases to govern as he ought to do; but this none (except some of *Corah's* Companions) will say, doth un-king him, and utterly destroy his Regal Capacity. And if this was the Case (supposing the worst) when the Prince of *Orange* Landed, the consequence is easie. Your Reply to the 18*th* and 19*th* Paragraphs I have already consider'd, to which you refer me, as if your chief strength lay therein. If it doth, I must tell you, that I am in no apprehensions of all the force you can bring against me.

(*N.* 23.) Here we are agree'd; and the Foundation of our agreement is——*That none are obliged to do any thing that is sinful, though it be commanded by the greatest Potentate upon Earth.*

But

But then I wish we were agreed in another point, which is, that we ought to suffer, rather than Rebel, when the Supream Power commands that which is sinful. These two things being granted, the matter might be easily accommodated betwixt us.

(*N.* 24.) I am for perswading Men to perform their Duty, both to God and their Country; but you will needs divide these two, and suppose Men Rebels either to the one or the other. And then you speak, as if (like one of the Jewish Zealots) you were appointed by God, to execute Vengeance upon the Rebellious. *How can I be true to my King and Country, if I let Men Rebel against the Laws, by violating them every day?* This is spoken like a Man of Authority, and carries with it such a dominant and decisive Air, as better becomes one of the King's Judges, than any private Man, as I suppose you to be. If you be otherwise, I beg your Pardon.

(*N.* 25.) But now comes the great Stumbling-block, *Passive Obedience*; which I find gives you such offence, that it puts you out of all patience, and makes you rave like a Man, who together with his Christianity, has also lost his Reason. Your Position is, that *Passive Obedience is Popery Established by Law, and by consequence, Slavery, whenever the Prince shall please.* To which my Answer was—*Passive Obedience is neither Popery nor Slavery Establish'd by Law, but the Doctrine of Jesus Christ, grievous to none but those, who desire to use their Liberty as a Cloak of maliciousness.* This Answer (you say) is not direct. Let's compare it with yours. *Passive Obedience* (you tell us) *is Popery, Establish'd by Law.* *Passive Obedience* (I say) *is neither Popery nor Slavery Establish'd by Law.* Which directly opposes your Assertion, taking in also the second Part of it; *and by consequence Slavery, whenever the Prince shall please.* I add over and above—*But the Doctrine of Jesus Christ is grievous to none, but those who desire to use their Liberty, as a Cloak of maliciousness.* I shall now (if you please) give you my Sense, in this Affirmative Proposition; *Passive Obedience, is Christianity Establish'd by the Gospel, and by consequence is so far from being Slavery, when*

ever

ever the Prince ſhall pleaſe, that they who always Act agreeably to this Principle, can never be made Slaves by the moſt Arbitrary Prince upon Earth. The Apoſtles and Primitive Chriſtians, who govern'd themſelves according to this Doctrine, were ſo far from being Slaves, that they were the moſt Free-men alive, at the ſame time when their Perſecutors were under the Dominion of their impotent Luſts and Paſſions; the worſt ſort of Slavery to which a Rational Man can be condemn'd.

But you'l Anſwer, That the Slavery which you mean, is that of the outward Man—*Firſt*, the Subjecting our Lives, Liberties and Eſtates to the Arbitrary Pleaſure of the Prince. To this I reply, That this ſort of Slavery, is falſely charged upon *Paſſive Obedience*; which is no more the cauſe of it, than righteouſneſs is the cauſe of Sin, or Vertue of Vice, becauſe ſinful and vicious Men may make their advantages both of the one and of the other. *Paſſive Obedience* is not ſuch a creeping thing as you imagine. It knows how and when to ſtand up in the Vindication of all goods Laws, and Laudible Cuſtoms of the Country, without running into Rebellion for God's ſake; or *making Chriſt to appear the Author of confuſion and deſtruction amongſt Mankind, inſtead of Juſtice and Order*; as your words are. *Paſſive Obedience* ſees, and obeys God in every thing; and is ready to vindicate all that's good and juſt, even with the loſs of life and all that's dear to Men in this World; but yet, will never by Violence and Force of Arms, endeavour to right it ſelf againſt its lawful Sovereign. Such a Subjection as it requires, is every where ſuppos'd in Scripture, and is agreeable to the Reaſon of Mankind, not blinded with Prejudice, or the Intereſt of this World.

By this Obedience, Chriſtianity was at firſt propagated, and it muſt be ſtill maintain'd. When all is done and ſaid; after we have try'd all the ways of preſerving our Liberties, *&c.* after we have kill'd and affrighted one another with Wars and Rumors of Wars; at the laſt, Paſſive Obedience rightly underſtood, will be found to be beyond all Stratagems and Strength; and Prayers and Tears (how much ſoever deſpiſed)

the

the ſtrongeſt Arms of your Church. To cheriſh this Doctrine, is not (good Sir) *to degenerate from Nature*, unleſs it be *corrupted Nature* which you mean; out of which Mr. *Hobs* and his Diſciples have taken their depraved Principles. This Doctrine neither tends to the deſtruction of Chriſtianity, nor any Human Society. On the contrary, it elevates and improves Men's Reaſon; and of Wild and Savage Heathens makes them mild and gentle Chriſtians, *true Diſciples and Followers of the Innocent, and Holy Jeſus, the Prince of Peace.*—To what a degree therefore of Folly and Madneſs, to give you your own words (but I hope better apply'd) are ſome Men arrived, who deride and damn a Doctrine, which is peculiar to Chriſtianity; and abſolutely neceſſary for the ſupport of the truly Ancient, Catholick and Apoſtolick Religion; againſt all the Perſecutions of *wicked and unreaſonable Men*; of what denomination ſoever?

I could eaſily recriminate and charge *Popery and Slavery* too, upon ſome of our late Proceedings; though the cry was altogether againſt theſe two Companions. But 'tis well known, that (the People of *England* having ſuch an irreconcilable hatred to theſe two Enemies of Religion and Liberty) the only way to introduce them, is loudly and bitterly to exclaim againſt, whilſt at the ſame time, all Arts are uſed to Eſtabliſh them, under ſome popular and ſpecious Pretences. But I ſhall not here draw this Parallel at length; only give me leave to ſay, that if *Odelſchalchi* himſelf, the late Pope, was conſulted, and the meaſures of the *Vatican* were followed in the late *Revolution*; this is no very great ſign, methinks, that the Intereſt of *Popery* is not at the bottom: And if the *Dutch* Scheme and Methods of Policy, muſt be the Standard and Platform of our Government (as 'tis very likely they muſt in moſt things, except the name of King) 'tis very probable, that, how much ſoever we may *promiſe Liberty to our ſelves*, we ſhall, at laſt, ſee our ſelves reduc'd to as great Slavery as the poor People are in *Holland*; where (if we will believe the learned *Grotius*, who had reaſon to know the State of that Country)

Country) *there remains nothing but the name of Liberty. Cum videam* (says he in his *Epistle* 298. written to *Ger. Vossius*) *apud vos, ubi tantum pro Libertate depensum est, vix quicquam ejus præter nomen restare.* Grot. Epist. fol. 108. But, to conclude this Section; This Doctrine of Passive Obedience ('tis true) as all that is good, may be abused. And I question not, but Men of Intrigue have endeavour'd to bring about their own bad Designs, by the means thereof. But, if the abuse of any thing is a sufficient Argument against it, the Sun it self, ought to be removed out of the Firmament; because Evil Men use the Light thereof, in the perpetration of the *Works of Darkness.*

N. 26.) What Q. *Elizabeth* did in reference to the *French* Protestants and the *Hollanders*, let the Statesmen answer for. I am no competent Judge in the case. I do not take upon me to dive into the Reasons of State, or determine concerning the Actions of Independent Princes, towards one another. If this great Patroness both of Law and Religion did deviate something from her usual measures in this Affair, it may serve to put us in mind, that the best of Governours and of Princes are but too apt sometimes to follow their Interest rather than their Duty. Her Answer to the *French* Embassador, in the Case of the Queen of *Scots*, was, I'm sure, of another Nature. *Abdicandi principes exemplum, perniciosum est, & infrà inferos damnandum. The Example of abdicating Princes is indeed pernicious; and ought to be condemn'd to the Pit of Hell.* Cambd. Eliz. Lat. fol. 223.

N. 27.) You have (you say) *as honourary a respect for a King as any Man whatsoever, whilst he continues his Kingly Office* (*i.e.* whilst he pleases you) *but when he shall degenerate and break all his sacred Oaths*; (*i.e.* when he doth not Rule according to your liking) *then you have* (i.e. you think you have) *Reason to turn your Love into Contempt.* Though all be true that you have said of King *James*, yet you have reviled the *Lord's anointed.* For who gave you Commission to tell him of Faults, and maliciously to publish such stuff to the World?

'Tis

'Tis neither decent, nor dutiful for a Private Person to lay open the failures and miscarriages of his Prince; and take all occasions (as you do in every Paragraph, and almost in every line of this Pamphlet) to expose him as a Person not only unfit to govern, but to live. This intemperate Zeal of yours, what popular Cloak soever you shall throw over it, to me appears to be nothing else, but *Reviling your King.*

To your Question, *what Right hath the King to the Throne, but from the People?* I will answer, when you can shew me, that the People ever had any Right at all to make Kings. In the mean time to your Question I shall only oppose this. What Right have the People (especially of *England*) to Judge, Condemn and Depose one Prince, and set up another? What ever becomes of the *Jure-Divino* Doctrine (which we shall speak of afterwards) the successive Hereditary Monarchy of *England*, is establish'd by Law, and you'l grant, I hope, that 'tis *Jure-Divino*, to maintain the *lawful Constitution* of every Nation.

(*N.* 28.) That God did command or appoint his own People the *Jews* to be govern'd by Monarchs all along, (tho they were not always call'd Kings) I do find by the Scriptures; That, he ever revoked that Form of Government, I do not read. Yet, I will not, I tell you, maintain, that all other Governments are sinful. If you be resolv'd to prove this (as you say you will, *p.*31.) pray do you undertake the Province; and shew us——*That the Government by Kings is necessary, and that all others are sinful.*

N. 29, 30.) I beg leave, Sir, to ask you where you have lived, that you *never till now heard that a Paternal* (*i. e.* A Fatherly Authority as you critically observe) *is a Kingly Authority.* Our Education, it seems, has been very different. For I scarce ever heard otherwise, but from those who would have all Kings to be so many *Nimrods*; not Fathers, but Robbers and Spoylers of their Country.

Why may it not be said, that *Adam* was a King, as to his Power and the Exercise of it, when besides the *Dominion*

given to him over the Fish of the Sea, the Fowls of the Air, &c. he had (as you grant) *Power and Authority over his Children, to subdue them, if Rebellious in disobeying his Commands?* What Power and Authority has any King greater than this? If he had *Dominion* over all Creatures, and *Empire* over all his numerous Family, you cannot reasonably deny, that (considering how long he lived, which was until about 620 Years of *Noah*'s Flood, for the Deluge happened after the Creation about the Year, 1656. And *Adam* lived 930 Years, so by a moderate Computation we may allow him to be a Monarch over some Millions of People) that he was the first, and none of the meanest Monarchs of the World. As for the name of King, I will not contend with you about the Word, if you yield the thing it self.

The Twelve Sons of Jacob, *after the Flood* (you agree) *were Chief Fathers, and Chief Head Princes of their Families: and such* (as you go on to argue for me, as well as I could wish) *was* Abraham *who was called a Father (not King) of many Countries.* All this confirms my Notion. For a Father of a Country is a King in my Sense of the Word. And consequently, the Patriarchs (being chief Fathers of Families and Countries where they lived) were, in effect so many Kings. And *Abraham* (being a Father of many Countries) was perhaps one of the most Potent Kings, at that time, in the World. Thus, during the time of the Patriarchs, there is no difference betwixt us, but about the name. —And this *Scripture-Notion of Kingly and Paternal Power being the same, Aristotle* himself (though no great Friend to Monarchies) had learn'd; when (convinc'd either by the Reason of the Thing or the Authority of these Holy Writings) he tells us——*That Regal Power belonged to the Father of the Family*, Polit. Lib. 1. Cap. 8.

We now pass on to the time of the *Judges*. And they (you say) *were not Monarchs, for the time being, but Rulers over the People.* Now that Judges were *Rulers of the People, for the time being*, is very true; but it doth by no means follow,

that,

that, therefore they were not *Monarchs*. For, 'tis evident that they were ſingle Rulers, that is, ſo many Monarchs or Kings *for time being*. As for the Text which you quote upon this occaſion, you might as well have referr'd us to any Text in the whole Bible, wherein the word (*Rulers*) is to be found. The words are—*Then* Peter, *full of the Holy Ghoſt, ſaid unto them, ye Rulers of the People, and Elders of* Iſrael, &c. Do you fancy, theſe Rulers, unto whom St. *Peter* here addreſs'd himſelf, to have been of the ſame Nature with thoſe, who were made Judges of *Iſrael*, after *Joſhua*'s time? If you do, I pitty your Ignorance. 'Tis ſuch a miſtake as muſt needs ſpoil your Credit, with all your Readers, even thoſe of the meaneſt Capacity; for whom you ſeem to write. After ſuch an eſcape as this, for ſhame, never pretend to ſet up for an *Expoſitor of Scripture*, and throw out ſuch fooliſh Challenges againſt thoſe, who, I aſſure you, do better underſtand theſe *Sacred Writings*, and have more Veneration for them, than to abuſe and pervert them ſo miſerably as you have done here and in other Places.

But to go on with you; you allow that *Melchiſedeck* and *Moſes*, are ſaid, in Scripture, to have been Kings, and that God alſo owned *Cyrus* for his *anointed*; but *Melchiſedeck was a Type of Chriſt*; Moſes *a very Holy Man*; Cyrus *made a Decree to Build the Houſe of God*; and therefore theſe Perſons (you ſay) were particularly honoured with theſe Titles. *It may, with Reaſon, be concluded, that God gave him an Honour above other Prophets, by making him a King* (ſay you of *Moſes*.) Now, ſince you grant the Title of a King to be an Honour, I hope, in time, you may be reconcil'd unto the Office; and not derive all Kings from *Nimrod*, who ſeems to have been recorded rather as a Tyrant, than a King; and may be the firſt Example of a wicked Prince, not the firſt Monarch, we meet with in the Scriptures.

The Judges and Officers, which the Children of *Iſrael* were commanded to make, throughout their Tribes (in Number 12, as you learnedly obſerve, and leſt we ſhould not believe

you, cite two Texts for it, *Gen.* xlix. 28. *Mat.* xix. 28.) These Judges and Officers, were all, at the time of their first institution, under *Moses*; and you know the end of some of these *Men of renown*, who rose up in Rebellion against him, who, at that time, was *King in Jeshurun*. And in after times these Judges and Officers, were all under the Kings of *Israel*; as our Judges and Officers are under the Kings of *England*. They were a sort of Magistrates, as much different from those Judges, who, in times of eminent danger, were chosen for *Israel*'s Deliverance; as the Pretors and other Officers, were from the *Roman* Dictators, who were made upon extraordinary occasions, and had the Power of the Sword committed to them *for the time being*. And so the Judges of *Israel* had Kingly Power, whilst God pleased to continue them in their Office; and though they are sometimes said to have been chosen by the People, yet in truth, they were always *raised up, and chosen* before by God himself, as *Gideon* was. *Judges* iv. 12, 13, 14. And so, this makes nothing at all, against the *Jure Divino Doctrine*; which yet, together with that of *Passive Obedience*, you grant, did obtain *during the time of the Children of Israel*. p. 35.

This concession I cannot let pass without some Observations upon it; though I profess I am quite tired with examining your bold Assertions; when you bring neither Wit, nor Argument, nor Scripture (which you pretend to the most and know the least) to support them. *Passive Obedience and Jure Divino, used* (you say) *to go together, during the time of the Children of Israel*. Very good! Then the Old Testament is on our sides; and these Doctrines (you yield) were once approved by God himself, and delivered by him to his own peculiar People. If this be so, I desire you to shew, that the New Testament has altered the Case, and parted these two inseparable companions in the time of the Jewish State; or else *Passive Obedience* and *Jure Divino* are still in force against you. Now, that the New Testament has made no alteration as to these things, I thus argue—Our Saviour strictly enjoyns

ns to render unto *Cæsar*, the things that are *Cæsar's*. *Passive Obedience* and *Jure Divino*, did by your own Confession, belong unto Kings, *during the time of the Children of Israel*; *i. e.* till the time of the Gospel.

Therefore I conclude, that the *Rights of Cæsar are from God*; and that we ought, *for the Lord's sake, passively to submit* to his commands, when we cannot *actively obey* them. And thus we are both by the Law and the Gospel bound to govern our selves by these Doctrins. To say, That what was true concerning the *King's of Israel*, is not so, when apply'd to the *Kings of the Nations*, will do you no service. For *Saul*, and the Kings of *Israel* from his time, were (as the People desired) Kings, *after the manner of the Nations*.

But to insist no further upon this, I go on; and must demand satisfaction of you for your scurrilous and prophane expressions, which you bestow upon those Doctrins, which you acknowledge, went together, *during the time of the Children of Israel*. To quote the Scriptures, for them, is (you say) to *wrest them*; when the Scriptures especially the Old Testament, every where (you confess) doth suppose them. *p.* 10. *They are Doctrins, which inevitably tend to the destruction of Christianity, and to all human Societies*; p. 26. *not fit for Savage Heathens, much less for rational Men.* ib. Those who assert them, *fit to be compared to Papists.* ib. They are *inhuman and damnable Principles.* p. 37. Now, as for mine own part, I can easily pass by and forgive all these hard words, were I, or any particular Doctrins of mine own broaching only concern'd therein; but when these false accusations, and lew'd *Epithites* do reach the Scripture it self, and reflect upon God's own Institutions, *during the time of the Children of Israel*, (by your own account) what can you say for your self? What amends can you make for the injury you have done to the *word of God*, and for the scandal which you have given to Religion, and all good Men? What reparation can you make, but by acknowledging your Crime, and your serious repentance for it? And how can your Repentance be so, if your Retractation be not as

public.

public, as the injury you have done to Religion; and the affront you have given to the Bible, and consequently to God himself, whose *Word* it is?

And as for the Doctrine of *Non-resistance* in particular, even the present Government it self is concern'd, to call you to an account, for what you have said about it. For, all it's true and real strength stands upon this bottom; and not upon the Principle of Fear, which is Tyrannical; and makes no conscientious impression upon Men's minds. *If a Man does not obey for Conscience sake* (as 'tis certain they do not who maintain the lawfulness of Rebellion in any Case) *all the Cords of outward Pacts and Covenants will not hold him, when he Dreams that the* Philistines *are upon him, and he can deliver himself by Force, from the Power of his Enemies*; *as* Dr. *Tennison* (in his *Hobs*'s *Creed*) assures us. *This is no more than the Loyalty of the Leviathan*; says Mr. *Pelling* (*Serm. Jan.* 30. — 83. *p.* 43.) How necessary soever the Doctrine of *Resistance*, sometimes may be thought to be in bringing Men to the top of Empire and Greatness; that of *Non-resistance* will always be necessary to keep them in Possession. Accordingly I perceive, that this Doctrine is now likely to have it's *Habeas Corpus*; and be discharged from all those horrible Indictments, which by you and others of your Spirit, have been brought against it. For I find, by the Title of a Late Pamphlet, 'tis now the opinion, that *this Doctrine is not concern'd in the Controversie betwixt the* Williamites *and the* Jacobites; (as some learned *Monk* has taught them to distinguish.) So that you see, Sir, one of your Points is drop't, and given up (as I may suppose) by Authority. For, we have notice of this Phamphlet, *in the Continuation of the Proceedings in* Scotland, N. 58. *Licensed and Entered according to Order.* And as for the other thing which so much offends you, the *Jure Divino Doctrine*, it follows of course. For if it be in no Case lawful to rise in Arms against our Sovereign Prince, 'tis a sure sign that his Character is more than human; and consequently, that it is in truth, Divine. And thus your quarrel is groundless, even in the Judgment of those, whom you pretend to

serve;

ſerve; and the Doctrins which you ſo furiouſly damn, and which have provok'd you to make this unaccountable Challenge, are receiv'd into favour, or at leaſt, begin to be look'd upon as innocent By-ſtanders, not concern'd in the Controverſie. And truly, the preſent Government, let me tell you, has as little Reaſon to ſuſpect theſe Principles, as it has to encourage ſuch a dubious and ill qualify'd Advocate for it, as you appear to be. All that you ſay, may be turn'd againſt one King as well as another; when your preſent Favourite ſhall diſpleaſe you, or his good ſucceſs ſhall fail him. And ſurely thoſe uſeleſs *Harangues* ought to be deſpiſed by all ſides, which do really ſerve none at all; and every Government, which bears the name of Kingly, ought to be jealous of one, who Advances ſuch Opinions, as do equally ſtrike at all Conſtitutions of that Denomination. I could eaſily preſent the Reader with a caſt of your Loyal Sayings, which are Treaſonous in the Eye of our Law, and have been often ſo adjudged when time ſhall ſerve, which ſide ſoever ſhall, at laſt prevail. So that, probably, you may live to make your own Recantation, and ask Pardon for your Republican Propoſitions and Aſſertions; inſtead of glorying in them, and undertaking to defend them, with your Learned Pen.

Thus, Sir, I have (according to your direction) examin'd this Paragraph; whether *well* or not, neither you nor I are to judge, but the honeſt and impartial Reader. This, I think, I may confidently ſay, that I have not *wreſted any Text of Scripture* (as you charge me) neither have I, I hope, *made any falſe aſſertion*. This (as I remember) is the third time you have accus'd me for *wreſting the Scriptures*. I do Challenge you to prove your Allegation, or elſe you muſt paſs for a *falſe Accuſer of your Brethren*, and you know, to whom that Character belongs.

As to your demand of proving Kings to be *by the Command and Appointment of God Almighty*; becauſe you are importunate, I ſhall at preſent lay down theſe things, which I ſhall inlarge upon, as you ſhall give occaſion. *Firſt*, That *de facto*, God hath

hath *commanded and appointed* Kingly Government in the Scriptures, and no other that I know of. *Secondly*, That Kingly or Monarchical Government is absolutely the best in it self. *Thirdly*, That in *England* particularly, is an Hereditary Monarchy; and ought to devolve successively upon the next of the Royal Line. When you shall think fit to shew your skill, by opposing these Assertions, I shall, according to my small Abilities, endeavour to defend them. But let me Advise you to be more Methodical and Argumentative than hitherto you have been, or else I shall loose no more time upon you; but conclude, that your Talent lies rather in Dictating *Political Aphorismes*, than proving them by the Force and Evidence of Reason; and that, you'r resolv'd to hold fast your Conclusions, whatever shall become of the poor Premises, which ought to support them.

(*N.* 31.) You here repeated over again, what you said *N.* 20. and 21. and which I have in these places already considered. I am not at leasure to take notice of your impertinent Objections, as often as you shall think fit to make them.

(*N.* 32.) As for the Law concerning an Usurper, or *de facto* King, 'tis the only appearance of Law, that you have on your side; which yet, if it be throughly scan'd, doth not in the least countenance, much less altogether excuse our late Proceedings. There are many things to be said concerning this Law, which the brevity of this discourse will not permit. I shall therefore breifly propose some things, which may be more fully insisted upon hereafter. As *First*, It cannot be reasonably supposed, that this Law doth Establish any such Principle, as they would draw from it, who produce it as an unanswerable Authority against all objections. The Principle, which our late States-men would draw from this Act, is, *That, Possession of the Throne, without any other Right, is a sufficient Title?* King *Hen.* 7. needed no such Principle, and therefore 'tis not probable, that the Parliament by which it was enacted, did intend to encourage any such Doctrine. Or, if it did, can it be thought that the ensuing Parliaments, would have left it un-

repeal'd all this time? In truth this Opinion—That *Poſſeſſion, without any other right, is a ſufficient Title*, is founded only upon Sr. *Edward Cook's* Authority, who firſt maintain'd, That a King *de facto* only, is *Seignieur Le Roy within the purview of the Statute of* 25 *Edw.* 3. Now Sr. *Edw. C.* though he was a great Lawyer, yet has been, 'tis very well known, remarkably famous for corrupting the Law, as much as ever any one of his Profeſſion, ever did. *Secondly*, Suppoſing, that this ſt. *H.* 7. did really intend to make Poſſeſſion a ſure Title, yet it cannot now be pleaded, becauſe 'tis vertually repealed by the firſt of Queen *Eliz.* by which Statute we are oblig'd to Swear to be true to the *Queen, her Heirs and lawful Succeſſors*, that is, thoſe who have a Right to the Crown, by proximity of blood. *Thirdly*, Suppoſing that this Statute is in Force at preſent, yet will not it be ſerviceable to thoſe who deſire to ſhelter themſelves under its Protection. For 'tis provided in this Act——*That no Perſon ſhall take benefit and advantage by this Act, which ſhall hereafter decline from his or their ſaid Allegiance.* This is the Proviſo of this Statute, upon which a very learned Perſon (whoſe Treatiſe I have by me, and out of which I muſt confeſs I have had moſt of theſe hints) thus argues. 'If Allegiance by 'this Act be due to a King *de facto*, then certainly (by the ſame 'Act) 'tis equally due to him, who is a King *de facto* and *de* 'jure too. Therefore thoſe who decline from their Alle'giance to a King *de jure*, are expreſsly bar'd from receiving 'any benefit by this Act. So that now they muſt lye un'der the Laſh of all thoſe Antecedent Laws, which puniſh all 'Diſloyal Practiſes againſt a rightful King, whether in, or out, 'of Poſſeſſion. Thus doth this judicious Perſon reaſon upon this Act. And accordingly 'tis certain, that (notwithſtanding this Act) by ſeveral Acts in the Reign of *Edw.* 4*th*, the *Henrys* were declared *Uſurpers*, and that during their Uſurpations, the Anceſtors of *Edward* the 4*th* were rightful Kings; and conſequently all thoſe, who were then alive, and did decline from their Allegiance to the Houſe of *York* (the Right Line) to the Houſe of *Lancaſter* (the Kings *de facto*) might have been con-

demn'd as Traytors, and precluded from having any benefit from this Statute. Notwithstanding therefore, any thing that you have said, or any other I have ever discours'd or read upon *this Subject*, the Oath of Allegiance to our King *de jure* still remains *in full* force and Verve, not only in point of Conscience, but of Law too.

(*N.* 33.) The Query is, Whether it *be for the Safety of the People, to violate the Right of Succession?* To have given a direct Answer, you should have shewn, That the good which attends this violation, is greater than the evil which may be feared from it. But instead of this, you run immediately to the Divine Law; and fall upon asking questions, which I am no more bound to Answer, than you are Authorised to propose. You ask, *whether the Salique Law in France, and the deposing the King of Portugal be according to this Law? And whether or no England for its security, may not exclude the next Heir to the Crown, or turn out he* (him you mean) *that shall be upon the Throne, who are* (is you should have said) *incapable, or will not govern according to the Laws of the Land?* I am no ways oblig'd to resolve these doubts, before it be decided, Whether to *violate the Right of Succession* (especially where it is Establish'd by Law) *be for the Safety of the People*. If this be once determin'd all your Queries will be easily solved; which otherwise cannot be Answered without Ambiguity. But because I love not to be uncivil, and because *the Safety of the People* rightly understood, doth never clash with the *Divine Law*; what if I shall give you this general Answer, which both confirms my Opinion (*i. e. that it is not for the Safety of the People to violate*, &c.) and satisfies your Demands, in reference to the *Divine Law?*

'Tis most beneficial to the publick, and most according to the *Divine Law*, that all Monarchies should be Hereditary and Successive; But yet this doth not hinder, but that some particular exceptions, might be lawfully made, by the Wisdom of a Nation, when the manner of the Succession was at

first agreed upon. Such an exception is the *Salique Law*; but in *England*, we have no such exceptions agreed upon by King and People. As for your Instances in 18. and 19. Replies, I have already accounted for them. I confess I never have been so happy as to have seen the *Fundamental Contract* of the Nation, by which the People are Authorized to depose their *King*; *upon pretence that he is incapable, or will not govern according to Law*; If you have it by you, and out of it can shew me that our Ancestors did (by vertue of this Charter) *make Kings and turn them out as they pleas'd*; you will much oblige me by a sight of it. Till then, I must own, that I think it *no less* (as you elegantly express it) *upon our Reason*, and that they were neither *Fools nor Madmen*, not to reserve to themselves such a Power. As for the business of *Portugal*, I am not so well vers'd in the Laws and Customs of that Nation, as to pronounce any thing about it.

(*N.* 24.) Here you insert the later part of your 29. Query, because, I was, it seems, so forgetful as not to take any notice of it in its proper place. I do assure you, Sir, this Omission was not because I thought it unanswerable, but rather because it deserved no Answer; and yet is treated as it deserves elsewhere. For you have repeated it more than once. However, because 'tis your Herculean Argument, and the very *Palladium* of your Cause, I shall here again consider it. *If Kings are by Divine Appointment, is it not rational to believe that God would have commanded all the World to have been govern'd by Kings, or at least the Christian World, and have given them a Law to govern by?*

This you; to which I Answer——*That Kings, whether they come to their Thrones by Inheritance, Donation, Conquest, or even Election it self, are by Divine appointment*, I do not think; *That God should therefore have appointed all the World to be govern'd by Kings, or at least, the Christian World*, by an express Law, *is not rational to believe*, unless it be *rational* to prescribe to God Almighty, and tell him what he shall do. Yet 'tis

 rational

rational to believe, that this is the Government which he most approves; because we do not find that ever he erected any other Form of Civil Government but this; or, that we are commanded to pray for any other sort of Governors, *but Kings and all in Authority under them.*

Episcopacy is by *Divine Appointment* or *Jure Divino*. Yet where do we find that God hath, in expreſs Terms, commanded all the World to be govern'd by Biſhops? Yet the Conſtant and Univerſal Practice of the Church, hath recommended this Government as the beſt, and moſt *agreeable to the Will of God*. And thus the Authority and Univerſality of Kingly Government, do argue that it has been received by all Countries and Nations, as moſt agreeable to the Law of Nature, and conſequently to the mind of him, who is the *Author of Nature*. *Principio* (ſays *Juſtin* in his Hiſtory) *rerum, gentium, nationumque imperium penes Reges erat. The Rule of all things, Countries and Nations, were in the hands of Kings, from the beginning.*

By what follows it appears, that you are only for a King of your own making. The Reaſon is, that you make and unmake him again when you pleaſe. For, if *the King for the time being*, exceeds his bounds, *then moſt certainly, the People who gave him his Authority, has Authority to take it away*; ſo that your King is only a King *durante populi beneplacito*, and *quamdiu bene geſſerit*. It concerns him therefore to look to himſelf, and beware of his pretended Friends, as much, if not more, than thoſe, whom he may account his Enemies. For the People, who are his Judges, are very hard to pleaſe, and ſeldom continue long in one mind. They are partial and paſſionate Judges; and will ſoon Pronounce him Guilty and caſt him off, as a *Perſon not fit to govern*, if he will not humour them in all their lawleſs and extravagant demands. And thus *Kings for the time being* (ſeeing they are only *Tenants at Will to the People*) are likely to have but a ſhort, and probably, no very merry Reign of it.

What a perilous thing were it to commit to Subjects the judgement, which Prince is Wise and Godly, and his Government good, and which otherwise? As though the Foot must Judge of the Head; an Enterprize very heinous, and which must needs breed Rebellion. Thus our excellent *Hom.* against Rebellion (*part.* 1.)

(*N.* 35.) *That the* Roman *Emperors did seldom Succeed by an Hereditary Right; and that the Primitive Christians were not bound to them by Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, you grant.* Yet, *the Commands* (you say) *of our Saviour and his Apostles for their Obedience — under pain of Damnation, were more binding, than any Oath those Princes could have required of them.* I conclude therefore *à Fortiori*; That, if the Primitive Christians thought themselves so strictly oblig'd to Obedience, by the Commands of our Saviour and his Apostles, when they had taken no Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, and when the Empire was not Hereditary; That, if their case had been ours (who have taken these Oaths, and live under an Hereditary Monarchy) they would have thought themselves to have been *doubly and tribly* bound to have been *subject to the higher Powers.* They would doubtless, if possible, have been more Faithful and Loyal to the Emperor than they were: And if any one should have illegally usurp'd the Empire, they, I'm fully perswaded, would (as we do) have judged it a thing utterly out of their Power, to have absolv'd themselves from these Oaths; and consequently, that they could not in Conscience, have taken any new Oaths which should have been imposed, contrary to their former most solemn Obligations. In short, they would to the last have asserted (as they had sworn) the just *Rights of the Emperors, his Heirs and lawful Successors.*

(*N.* 36.) You *ask, Why I undertake to prove the Doctrine of Passive-Obedience, and do not joyn Jure-Divino to it?* Truly, Sir, for any opposition that you can make, I may undertake

to

to prove any thing. I have indeed undertaken to prove the *Doctrine of Passive-Obedience*; and, if it will oblige you, I will also make good that of *Jure-Divino*, as I understand it; not *in your Sense*; as I told you before. For you think, that this Doctrine cannot be true, unless all those who are not under a Monarchical Government, be in a *damnable State*. This, I tell you once more, is no true consequence, and I do not undertake for it; how *inhuman and damnable* soever you may think my *Principles* to be.

You allow, *That during the time of the Children of* Israel (as I have observ'd before) *when God did set up Kings, that* Passive-Obedience *and* Jure-Divino *went together; but now* ('tis your Opinion) *they have ceased.* Why so, I beseech you? Were they only Typical and Figurative Observances? Were they some of those weak and beggarly Elements, from which the Gospel hath emancipated, and set us free? Shew this, or else they still remain Obligatory to you and me and all Christians; as well as formerly to the *Jews* (as I have remarked above.) If you say, that the *Jewish* Kings were of God's appointing, and ours are not; and that therefore these Doctrines cease to oblige, I utterly deny your Antecedent; and do maintain, That our Kings are as well of God's setting up as the *Jewish* were of Old. For by God's Appointment Kings succeeded one another, by an Hereditary Right; except when he pleas'd, by some particular Revelation, to Command otherwise. *By me Kings Reign*, is a Text applicable to the Kings of *England*, as it was to those of *Israel*; that is, they instruct us, that all lawful Kings do Reign, not only by Divine Permission (as you pervert these words) but Commission; as all good Expositors understand them. At the first, you must grant, that Kings were made by God himself; and where, and when, I desire to be inform'd, hath he assign'd this Power over to the People? Not surely, when they rebelled against *Moses* and against *Aaron*; no, nor when *Saul* had *broken his Coronation-Oath* with a Witness; *and ceased to*

govern

govern according to the best Law, that ever any People lived under.

As for the *Contrarieties* which you desire *me or any Man else to reconcile*, I wish that I may never be put upon an harder task; for then, I shall never need to call any *other Man* to my Assistance. Is it a *contrariety* to say, that he who *resists*, (*i.e.* By force of Arms) *doth not only resist the Usurpations of Men, but the Ordinance of God, though the Person be a* Claudius *or* Nero: *And that Absolute and Unconditionate Obedience is due only to God, and to the King no otherwise, than as he is his Vicegerent*: Are these things inconsistent, with that *averseness*, *which I profess to have from having my Throat cut either by* French *or* Irish *Dragoons*? You, who advance the Principle of Self-preservation above all Laws Divine and Humane; will you not suffer me, to be so far *influenc'd by it*, as to have some Reluctances of Flesh and Blood, and to avoid Persecution (if I may honestly do it) when yet rather than resist the *Ordinance of God*, I'm willing meekly to submit to any Punishment? But when I said, *I am, and shall be as averse as you from having my Throat cut*, &c. You thought, I'l warrant you, that my meaning was---I am and shall be as forward to handle my Weapon, and resist by force of Arms, as your self. You much mistake, if you understand me in this Sense. And so your supposed *Contrariety* vanishes into nothing. But I have said more than enough upon this occasion; having already, in the beginning of this Answer, clear'd my self from this Imputation; as also that of being a *notorious Hypocrite*, as your extraordinary *Sincerity* is pleased kindly to salute me. I will not recriminate; yet let me Counsel you for the future, to be more modest in your personal Reflections; if you intend, that you and I shall have any further Discourse upon these Points.

(*N.* 37.) And now, Sir, as for my Conversation (which you do Hypothetically accuse) it has, I hope, been *agreeable to my Sentiments*; and my Prayer is, that it may ever so continue.

tinue. They that know me can, and many I question not, will (if there was occasion for it) testify, that I have always even in the worst of times, freely declar'd my self against all Rebellious and Schismatical Practices. And, I am so far from being asham'd of what I have done, that I shall, notwithstanding all discouragements, still endeavour, by the Grace of God to approve my self a Loyal Subject, and an Obedient Son of the Church of *England*; *however* she shall be *distress'd*, or *whereſoever dispers'd*. 'Tis my Religious Constancy to the Monarchy and Church of *England*, which moved me to bestow a few Remarks upon your Paper; which is so destructive both to the one and the other. And, tho now, Ruine and Destruction seem to threaten both; yet, I doubt not, if our Sins do not prevent (which God forbid) but that we, once more, shall see the time, when our Holy Mother shall appear from behind the Cloud, in her former Lustre, and Majestic Simplicity: When those her otherwise Pious and Learned Sons, who, I hope, have rather suspended, than quite abjur'd their Duty, shall return into her Bosom: when renouncing all Rebellion, Heresy and Schism, we shall all, as usually, *go into the House of God as Friends; and with one Heart and one Mind glorify him, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

(*N.* 38.) And now I have almost done with my Author; and should indeed here conclude; but that he would account me rude, or something worse, if I should make no return to his Challenge; which here he sends me and all other Men, who still persist in these *inhuman and damnable Principles*; that is, to all *Passive-Obedience and Jure-Divino Men in* England, *nay in the whole World*, as the direction is more civilly worded in his first Paper.

Really, Sir, you have acquitted your self with so little Honour in the management of your *first* Challange, that neither I, nor any one else, can expect to gain any Credit, by accepting your *second*. Yet that, if possible, you may

be

be brought to know your self, and your *Hogan Mogan* Courage may be a little humbled; I have, without any Seconds, ventur'd, you see, to enter once more with you, into the Lists; for, to what purpose should I (as you advise) *consult with others*, when I have such an easie Adversary to deal withal? Two (they say) are too many for *Hercules* himself; I'm sure one is an over-match for a Man of your Skill and Conduct. And Pardon me, Sir! if (as mean Opinion as I have of my self,) I am encouraged, by the advantage of my Cause, to engage with such a *Goliah* in Controversy as your self.

Your bold Challenges and small Performances brings to my Mind the *Italian* Proverb; which I think may not be improperly apply'd to your self,

——*un altro Orlando,*
Non con fatti, ma parlando,

In Truth, you're just another Orlando;
Not in Deeds, but saying what you can do.

You talk a *La Cavaliere*, and as if no body could stand before you; when your performance is so mean, that there's not a *Passive-Obedience-or-Jure-Divino-Man in England*, no nor I believe in *the whole World*, but will easily make his part good with you, and baffle your ill-guarded Propositions. I profess my self one of the meanest of them; yet appoint your place, and fit your Weapons; I am once more at your Service, to dispute the Truth of these Doctrines with you.

But, if you shall think fit to appear again, let me counsel you to take more care of your *English*, than to offend against

against the common Rules of Grammar; to avoid Repetitions as much as may be (for I'm sensible that all that you and I have said, abating those Tautologies, may be comprised in a much less room;) to be more clear and distinct in your Reasonings, and more consistent with your self; not to accuse me for wresting the Scriptures, when your self do so very much abuse these Sacred Writings: Lastly, abstain (if I may obtain that favour of you) from fixing odious Names and Characters, upon Things or Persons; unless you shall be very well assured, that they deserve them. Let your Arguments be as hard as Rocks; but let modesty and ingenuity direct and accompany your Words.

And thus you have both my Answer and Advice. If the one doth not satisfy you; it's your own concern more than mine, to follow the other. But if you shall reject both the one and the other; I have only lost so much time upon you, though I hope, others, may reap some little benefit from what hath been said. I profess, had I found any thing in this Answer of yours, to have convinc'd me that these Principles are *erroneous* and *damnable*, I should have here publickly recanted them; for I desire willingly to Sacrifice my Reputation to the Interest of *Truth*, and our *Common Salvation*. But being fully confirm'd in these Doctrines (and more by the weakness of your Objections) I resolve, by the Grace of God, to be true to the Convictions of mine own Mind, and never by any mean, sneaking and unlawful Compliances, to renounce those Principles, which are founded upon Reason, Law and Scripture; as they have been defended not only with the Tongues and Pens, but the Blood and Lives of the wisest Men, and best Christians in all Ages of the Church. And particularly, the Church of *England* has always, ever since the dawning of the Reformation, defended these Doctrines with all Christian Meek-

Meekneſs, Simplicity and Courage. And 'tis a ſurpriſing Change to find ſuch a ſudden and extraordinary Alteration in ſo many of her Sons; and thoſe otherwiſe, both her Ornament and Glory. This turns her Joy into Sadneſs, and her rejoycing into Tears. Her Clergy for their Learning and Piety, and Conſtancy in the Faith, uſed to be the *wonder of the VVorld.* And how fearful, how ſollicitouſly concern'd is ſhe, (leſt for Reaſons of another nature, and which ſhe is unwilling to mention) it be now ſaid—*Stupor mundi Clerus Brittannus?*

Post-script
TO THE
AUTHOR.

SIR,

I Have thought fit not to give your Bookseller the trouble of these Papers. And one Reason is, because as (I remember) it was about four Months before I heard any thing of that short Answer, which (according to your Direction) I sent before to Mr. Randal Taylor: *So that I had almost given over all expectations of seeing any thing against it. But at last, when you had finished the great Work, you were resolv'd, That the World should know it by giving notice of your Performance, in the Public* Gazette. *And truely, had you not done so, it's probable, that I (as well as others) had still been ignorant, That any Return was made.*

As

As soon as I had this found, that you had undertaken me, I expected that your Atchievement had been answerable to the pompous Proclamation of it; And therefore I presently sent for your Book. But how fearful, may you imagin, was I to open it, and see my self led in Triumph after your Victorious Propositions! However, I ventur'd to read it from one end to the other; And after I had done, found my self as safe and sound, as I was before, notwithstanding all the terrible Shocks, of your High and Mighty Assertions. This encourag'd me to set Pen to Paper, and defend what I had Written. To defend one's self is natural, but the obligation to defend the truth is indispensible. And truely, the Cause is so good, and your Objections so very insignificant, That no Commendation is due to me, if those things, which I offer to the ingenuous and honest Reader, shall be thought a full and sufficient Reply to all your pitiful Cavils, false Reasonings, ungrammatical Periods, and (what is worse than all those) malicious Reflections upon a Company of Men, whose Learning and Piety, will perpetuate their Names, as long as useful Knowledge and true Christianity shall have any esteem amongst Men.

Let me farther acquaint you, that if you shall ask, why this Answer comes out so late; it is for a Reason, which you know very well, and I need not stand

to

to explain. Had the Press been as open for Writings of this kind, as it is for those of a contrary nature; My Papers had been Printed, as they were finished, within a very little time, after I received your Answer. However at last you see, they have made a shift to get into the World. And as for the Principles, which they maintain, they are free Denizons, and naturalized Subjects of England; And how much soever they may be blamed, yet if they may be heard (as the Judges of the Areopagus did their Advocates) in the dark, they are not afraid to appear before the Bar of the strictest Justice. That is, if Partialities of Affection and Passion be laid aside, they will I perswade my self not only be acquitted, but encourag'd. But as for Men of your interests and prejudices, they expect nothing less than to be put out of the Protection of the Laws, and (as Strangers and Foreigners) sent back to the poor, distressed and suffering State of Christianity, from which (you confess) they came, and to which (as you will have it) they only belong. In the mean time, how hardly soever they may be treated by you and your Brethren, they assure themselves of a kind Reception from all, whose Prayers and Endeavours are sincerely directed to the good and prosperity of the State and Church of England; and more especially (when by such Judges as your self,

they

they shall be condemn'd as pernicious and damnable Principles) *they doubt not but that, at least, they shall have the* benefit of their Clrgy; *for whose Reputation and Honour they are cheifly concern'd.*

FINIS.

5031